The Truth Unveiled

An Explanation *of the* Biblical Greek on Race

With Scripture from
The Anointed Standard Translation,
Second Edition.

Why is the book necessary? Today we live in an hour of moral anarchy. Adamic Christians are being asked, if not told, to commit racial suicide by interbreeding with non-Adamic and mongrel races. We are told that the desire to live separately from criminals is a manifestation of hatred.

Yet, our forefathers did not believe in race-mixing and pointed to the Bible as their authority. To say that there has been a conspiracy to conceal the racial truths of the Bible is an understatement, particularly in the United States, where the prevailing moral viewpoint of our ancestors has been that the New and Old Testaments forbade race-mixing. Daily bombardment with propaganda and changing definitions of common English words has done much to lead the Adamic people away from the racial truths of the Bible, especially for those who read the most popular English translations such as the King James Version.

Contrary to politically correct teachings, a Civil War was fought in the United States primarily because the majority of white people and most blacks did not want to commit the moral crime of miscegenation. The South reacted in fear of the loss of white womanhood, and the North in fear of the South creating a Negro republic. These were the true underlying reasons why men took up arms to settle the state's rights and slavery questions. Early in the history of the United States, Christians used the moral teachings of the Bible to justify their abhorrence of and policies against race-mixing, either with American Indians, swarthy foreigners, or Negros. Where did they arrive at the idea that the Christian Bible taught that miscegenation was a crime against God? Could it be that those educated men and women had an understanding of the Hebrew, the Greek, the Latin, and the English languages that led to the belief that the God and His Word forbid miscegenation?

Since the time of the American Civil War, there has been a

concerted effort to engineer society to achieve the goal of concealing and removing racial knowledge from the Bible, and from the Adamic people. The people of America, particularly of the South, have been subjected to program after program designed to stamp out all racial knowledge and fear of God from the hearts of the people. We have seen the monumental efforts of the federal government in more recent times under Roosevelt's "New Deal" or Johnson's "Great Society," and other "social justice" movements and acts. Of men professing Christianity, of the North and of the South, it is certain that both used the Christian Bible. The powers that be have purposefully manipulated and engineered society away from the practices of their ancestors and Christian forefathers.

The central planners of this New World Order knew that in order for their plan to work it was essential to get the Bible out of public schools and prayer to God out of public functions. And above all, they knew they must gain political control of the Churches, and this they did by employing the IRS and the ACLU to deceive Churches into giving up their traditional constitutional right of existing as free Churches. The same goal that had been achieved by bayonet in atheist, Communist Russia was achieved in America through deception, coercion, and intimidation, with the understood goal of implementing a secular godless society and the destruction of a Constitutional Republic where the people were not afraid to speak the name Jesus Christ.

Talmudists and Humanists, who dominate all of the media concerns in this nation, have created an immoral society, robbed our children of their heritage, and claim the false authority to define what it means to be a Bible Christian. The socializers of society have usurped a Christian-based society and replaced it with a secular, atheist, humanist society. This is at it's core godless atheism, though presented in many guises and forms. Any society that is anti-Christ, whether they call themselves Communists or Humanists, is still anti-Christ, and therein is the problem. A small minority of people have imposed their antichrist philosophy upon the majority, and therefore destroyed the Constitutional Republic of the United

States that was firmly built on a foundation of Christ.

One of the purposes of this book is to prove and show the truth-loving students, disciples, and brethren of our Savior how to overcome the rampant deception of Western pseudo-scholarship. False Western scholarship has purposely and willfully been calculated, planned, and designed to conceal the racial truth of God's Word, as well as the classical literature of the Western white man. Additionally, certain foundations under the auspices of universities and other organizations have systematically removed the literature and writings of our ancestors who taught and believed the racial truths of the Bible and Christian persuasion.

The quest of this research is to determine whether there was any legitimate etymological grounds for holding such views. Our desire herein has been to provide those who love the truth of God's Word with an exhaustive statement on the subject of race in the Bible. While we are aware that this book will not settle the controversy regarding the racial consciousness of God's Word, it is our prayer that it will provide truth-lovers with an authoritative statement never before brought foreword to the American people.

In this book, we have sought to simply state the case and to do so in such a way as to make an admittedly complicated subject much easier. In presenting the facts as we have, we believe that they will have an appeal to anyone seeking the truth and who are willing to use that rare commodity known as common sense. In bringing forward these willfully hidden truths of the racial consciousness of the Bible, we no doubt place in the hands of the antichrists more ammunition for them to call God's Word hate literature. But an objective person should remember that it was God Almighty who created the different races and established their biological and territorial boundaries. For those who will check the record, they will find that those who dare to call the New Testament of Jesus Christ hate literature are in fact the Jewish Talmudists and degenerate, perverted homosexuals.

When the first part of this book was originally published in *Forbidden Truth*, we brought forward astounding Biblical facts.

To say the least, they were not received with open arms, and for the simple act of telling the truth we incurred the profuse hatred of race-mixers and homosexuals. We should like to point out, however, that we did not write the Bible in Greek. Neither did we write the Babylonian Talmud, which we consider to be the true source of profuse hatred and perversion. We therefore cannot be held responsible for what the literature actually says.

Thus, we have not invented the definitions or conclusions drawn by the scholars we have quoted. We have simply sought to bring them to the attention of the American people. However, we do believe that when God says in His Ten Commandments, "Do not mongrelize," that it is as binding as "Thou shalt have no other gods beside me." And when the Apostle Paul said **"Or do you not know that the unjust ones will not inherit the government of God? Do not be led astray, neither prostitutes, nor idolaters, nor mongrelizers, nor effeminates, nor homosexuals,"** is it not fair to quote the Apostle literally? For those who may doubt that these are the literal words of Almighty God, let them study with careful reflection the following pages.

Table of Contents

Introduction 9
Note On Greek Lexicons 11

I SRN 185 ἀκέραιος-akeraios 17
II SRN 172 ἄκακος-akakos 29
III SRN 97 ἄδολος-adolos 37
IV SRN 573 ἁπλόος-haploos 41
V SRN 572 ἁπλότης-haplotes 47
VI SRN 574 ἁπλῶς-haplos 59
VII SRN 1506 εἰλικρινής-eilikrines 65
VIII SRN 2513 καθαρός-katharos 71
IX SRN 1505 εἰλικρινεία-eilikrineia 87
X SRN 1103 γνήσιος-gnesios 91
XI SRN 1104 γνησίως-gnesios 99
XII SRN 283 ἀμίαντος-amiantos 107
XIII SRN 3541 νόθος-nothos 117
XIV SRN 3432 μοιχός-moichos 127
XV SRN 3435 μολύνω-moluno 199
XVI SRN 3436 μολυσμός-molusmos 203

APPENDIX I: Belial 209
APPENDIX II: Septuagint vs. Masoretic Text 213
APPENDIX III: The NETS (Septuagint) 225
APPENDIX IV: Grammatical Terms Used 233
APPENDIX V: Greek Pronunciation Key 235

Works Cited and Consulted 237
Indices 241

Introduction

The first edition of *The Truth Unveiled* combined two previous books, *Forbidden Truth* and *Hidden Truth*. The two works were later combined and revised throughout and published under the title, *The Truth Unveiled*. The revisions have been in the way of addition, updating, simplification, and style. Also, in many cases, new, stronger proofs have been added. It is hoped that the information, in its present form, will be more convenient for the study of the reader. The information has also been updated to conform to standard conventions being made in the Anointed Standard Translation of the New Testament.

These conventions in no way affect the work of the two previous books but are only meant to promote uniformity throughout the translations and add to the strength of the proofs presented herein. The translation of New Testament passages continue to conform to The Anointed Standard Translation of the New Testament, Second Edition. Any differences between the AST and the previous literal translations of *Forbidden Truth* and *Hidden Truth* were arrived at because of new information in light of the entire translation of the New Testament.

This edition contains additional proofs and evidence, though it is largely unchanged from the First Edition. First, we bring forward twelve synonyms from the New Testament that have a meaning of *pure*, both in a physical sense, such as *racially pure*, and a moral sense, such as *pure in mind*. Some of the words are strictly physical and unequivocally mean *racially pure*, or *nonmongrelized, pure in blood*. Others have a spectrum of meanings, but all revolve around the concept of *purity*, and their meaning is ultimately determined by the context in which they are used, demonstrating beyond any doubt the racial consciousness of Jesus Christ and His Apostles. These twelve words are as follows: ἄδολος (adolos), ἄκακος (akakos), ἀκέραιος (akeraios), ἁπλότης (haplotes), ἁπλόος (haploos), ἁπλῶς (haplos), εἰλικρινής (eilikrines),

or for that matter other later and more watered-down lexicons, unless we can prove them to have been wrong in their philosophy and incorrect in their definitions.

Therefore, we have used two different Liddell and Scott Greek lexicons: the 1846 edition printed by Harper Brothers and edited by Henry Drisler; and the 1974 edition printed by the Clarendon Press and fortunately not edited by Henry Drisler. (This edition was first printed in 1872 in the same form). However, the 1974/1872 edition has gone through numerous editions and a major abridgment and is void of all historical references as to the usages of the words and most all etymological references. It has been condensed to the simplest of terms and is considered nothing more than a quick handbook. The 1846 edition is much larger, some 1700 large pages as opposed to the 1974 edition's 804 small pages, and contains the valuable historical and etymological references. It is for this reason that we are forced to rely upon the 1846 edition to a much greater extent than the 1974/1872 edition.

The 1974/1872 edition, however, having never been edited by Henry Drisler, is invaluable as a tool of comparison, because the grim reality is that all too often Henry Drisler has edited great portions of the definitions, especially those that would promote a Biblical racial consciousness, out of the British edition he based his work upon, and some parts of these deletions are still contained in the 1974 edition, being a direct descendant of the original British edition published by Liddell and Scott in the 1830's (although greatly abridged). Henry Drisler imposed a rule upon himself that whenever he edited something out of the British edition, he would place a dagger symbol (†) immediately to the left of the Greek word. By way of example, we shall cite two instances out of the many hundreds where not only has he edited something from the original, but he has also failed to signify this by placing his editor's dagger to the left of the word.

In the 1846 Edition of Liddell and Scott edited by Henry Drisler, regarding the word γνήσιος (gnesios), he gives the following definition as it appears on page 296: "Belonging to the race, lawfully begotten, born in wedlock, a true, own son,

καθαρός (katharos), εἰλικρινεία (eilikrineia), γνήσιος (gnesios) γνησίως (gnesios), and ἀμίαντος (amiantos). All twelve of these words are used synonymously, as confirmed by Richard Trench in his book *New Testament Synonyms*. Rick Berry, in the supplementary synonym guide to his *New Testament Interlinear*, makes a similar statement. Liddell and Scott inter-relate these words in their definitions. We would like to remind the reader again that we have not arrived at these definitions or conclusions alone, and refer throughout the book to recognized classical language and Biblical scholarship sources.

We similarly study four Greek words from the New Testament that carry a meaning of *mongrel*, *mongreled*, or *mongrelize*, or in other words, *impure*. Because the antichrists have sought to cover up the truth regarding the meaning of the word *adultery*, we made it a point to exhaust the New and Old Testament usages of the Greek word μοιχός (moichos), usually translated as *adultery*.

We have provided all New Testament occurrences of these sixteen words, and as many Septuagint (the Greek Old Testament) usages as time and space would allow. A discussion of the words' etyma[1], SRN (Strong's Reference Number), and phonetic pronunciations are also provided.

For the New Testament passages discussed, the King James Version and the Anointed Standard Translation have been provided along with notes on the important words used in the subject verse other than the main word being discussed, or the subject word.

---

[1] "The original form of a word either in the same language, the word in a foreign language or in an ancestral language, the word in a foreign language that is the source of a particular loanword, the literal meaning of a word according to its origin, a word or morpheme from which words are formed by composition or deriviation."

Introductory Note On Greek Lexicons

In this book we have used Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon almost solely as our Greek authority, and so time should be given in considering this work.

These men brought to their work preconceived theological notions and ideas that we have shown, herein, to be greatly influenced by the romantic, humanist philosophy of the Masorete Jews. While we have made use of their definitions, it will, in the conclusion, become obvious to the reader that these definitions are often watered-down and sugar-coated euphemisms. Still we have proceeded to use Liddell and Scott as our definers for two primary reasons.

First, because they are and continue to be, recognized as leading authorities on the Greek language, and they are universally accepted by the Judeo-Christian world. We have therefore held to their definitions to necessitate those who disagree with the statements of this book to have to refute their own Judeo scholars, which they hypocritically deny not only in word, but also in deed. For it is an easily proven fact that contemporary Judeo-Christianity does not reflect the form of Christianity practiced in 1846, let alone the primitive Christianity practiced by our Lord and Savior and His Holy Apostles.

In addition to this, we have consciously decided, in an attitude of compassion, to intellectually force the deceived populace of our race to have to refute their own scholars. This we have done in the ever lingering hope that they will return to their first love of truth, overcome the deception of the manifest antichrists, and awaken from the ignorant grave of death into the marvelous light that Christ has bestowed upon His elect and chosen kinsmen, the true Israel of God.

The second reason that we have proceeded to use Liddell and Scott as definition authorities, though not completely agreeing with them, has been to show wherein they have concealed and covered up the truths of God's Word. There is little point in stating that we disagree with Liddell and Scott,

real, genuine, true, opp. to νόθος (nothos), legitimate, lawful, real, unfeigned virtues, to have a noblemind, genuine, lawfully, really, true." However, in the 1974 edition of the Liddell and Scott Greek-English Lexicon, never edited by Henry Drisler, we find on page 143 this definition for the exact same word: "Belonging to the true race, legitimate, opp. νόθος (nothos), genuine, true, lawful, true, to have a noble mind." While the British edition has much of the definition edited out, we do see that the original contained the word true in the phrase *belonging to the true race*. Drisler's deletion of the word *true* makes the word appear less definite and also rules out the concept that there is a true and acceptable race as opposed to an unacceptable, mongrel race. We need look no further than the word νόθος (nothos) discussed in the definition above for another example of his dishonest and hypocritical editing practices.

Let us give first Drisler's definition, from the 1846 edition of Liddell and Scott, p. 981: "a bastard, base born son, one born of a slave or concubine, at Athens also any child born of a foreign woman, spurious, counterfeit, supposititious[2]." Now in the 1974 edition's definition of the exact same word, we find on page 466 the following: "illegitimate, born out of wedlock, spurious, counterfeit, **adulterated**." Here he has edited out a word that is the key to a true understanding of νόθος (nothos), if not the very Kingdom of Heaven, the word *adulterated*. Once again the British edition is void of words such as *bastard* and *base born son*, but it contains perhaps the most important word of all in this definition, a word edited out willfully and intentionally by Henry Drisler. In his edition, without even following his own guidelines by placing a dagger in front of the word νόθος (nothos), he edited out the English word *adulterated*. That is an act of deception.

Why are knowing these things so important?

The answer to our question is very simple. The 1846 edition of Liddell and Scott was among the first American Greek lexicons, and more than any other American lexicon,

---

[2] Substituted for the real thing; not genuine.

has had the most profound effect in shaping what today passes as American Judeo Theology. All other American, so-called Greek authorities, such as Young, Thayer, Strong — all of these men simply mimicked the dishonest work of Henry Drisler. The importance of this fact may be seen when men consult their handy Strong's Concordance to seek to find out what a Greek word that they find in their New Testament may or may not mean, for the fact is that when we trace down what men think their Bibles say, all of the roads lead to the diabolical and incredibly dishonest Henry Drisler. In effect, entire denominations of professing Christians have based many of their beliefs upon the work of a willful liar. It therefore becomes of the utmost importance that men who seek to understand the foundational principles of Primitive Christianity do more than take the word of a dishonest charlatan as their authority for their Christian faith. At best, even that would be only a beginning, for the sad truth is that many of those lexicographers that followed the humanistic Henry Drisler did little more than take the language of the King James as their authority for defining Greek words, and in truth made little effort to enhance the average person's understanding of the Biblical Greek.

Thus, the importance of seeking the truth becomes painfully apparent when we realize that that which we as Americans have chosen to call American scholarship is for the most part built upon one of the greatest farces in all of history. It is a house built upon sand and those who uphold the tenets of the pseudo-faith that it has been designed to establish have immediately sealed their fate with those whom the Bible declares will have their part in the Lake of Fire with all liars and those who help make a lie.

Thus, who was the Diabolical Henry Drisler?

Henry Drisler was born on December 27th, 1818, on Staten Island, New York, and died on November 30th, 1897. He entered Columbia College in 1835 and graduated in 1839, becoming a Classical Master in the Columbia Grammar School and was, four years later, made a tutor of Greek and Latin. In 1857 he succeeded to the first professorship established at

Columbia in Latin as a separate field.

Ten years later he followed Charles Anthon as Jay-Professor of Greek. He was acting president of the College for the year 1878 and also between 1888-1890. He served as a trustee of the Astor Library and also the New York Public Library. He was vice-president of the Archeological Society of America in 1886-1889. Upon his retirement, a gold medal was struck in his honor; the Henry Drisler Fellowship in Classical Philology was founded; and money was donated to the newly created Henry Drisler Classical Fund.

We learn more about him by examining another man, his teacher, Charles Anthon. He worked with Anthon in publishing many of Anthon's most famous works, including his Classical Dictionary, several text books, and edited for him Riddle and Arnold's Copious and Critical Latin Lexicon. As we said before, he finally succeeded Anthon as Jay-Professor of Greek at the University.

We see also that Drisler's edition of Liddell and Scott is dedicated to Anthon, with the words: "To Charles Anthon, LL.D., Professor of the Greek and Latin Languages in Columbia College, This volume is most respectfully Dedicated, as a token of admiration, ... a tribute of gratitude, ... a memorial of friendship, ... during many years of almost daily intercourse, by his pupil and friend." Drisler was influenced beyond measure by Anthon and looked up to him immensely. So now the question becomes, Who was Charles Anthon?

Charles Anthon lived between 1797 and 1867. He was born into a very distinguished New York family, one of two surviving sons of Dr. George Anthon and his second wife Genevieve Jadot. He also had six other half-siblings by Dr. Anthon's first wife. He attended the best schools and entered Columbia in 1811 to study law, hoping to become a successful lawyer in the practice of his brother John Anthon, who is now considered to have been one of the best and most influential New York lawyers of the nineteenth century. His brother certainly had the power and influence to have been the Governor of the State of New York, had he so desired. John

Anthon drafted many acts that were examples of how our modern court system is organized today. Charles finished his law degree and was admitted to the bar, but his interests had changed and in 1820 he was chosen as the adjunct professor of Greek and Latin in Columbia College. He wrote volumes of information and textbooks that were the foundation of all Greek and Latin textbooks used since in America.

When he died, a speech entitled Charles Anthon, A Commemorative Discourse, was presented by Henry Drisler at the request of the Trustees of the College, for Henry Drisler was the man who knew him best. Pages could be written on Anthon and the effect he had over the entire Classical community, but we would point to just a few simple facts. Anthon was of a dark complexion and as the Dictionary of American Biography states, "his eyes [were] black and deeply set." It goes on to say that "he never married" and "he had no religious or political associations." In fact, Anthon was long believed to have been an atheist, and some have even speculated that he may have been Jewish.

In addition to this, because of the little that is known of Drisler's and Anthon's personal lives, because of the fact that Anthon never married, and because of the warm and close relationship that they publicly displayed, it is hypothesized that they were homosexuals. We may never know for an absolute fact that Anthon and Drisler were homosexuals, no matter how conclusive the evidence, but what we do know is that both men worked more than 100 years of combined time shaping the way the American Classical community is today, and that both men did all in their power to degenerate true scholarship, and provide the textbook authority for Judeo "Christianity".

I

SRN 185 ἀκέραιος-akeraios

The Greek word ἀκέραιος (akeraios), which is pronounced *ak-er'-ah-yos*, occurs three times in the New Testament (Matthew 10:16; Romans 16:19; Philippians 2:15) and once in the Septuagint (Esther 8:13). We will look first at Philippians 2:14-15 (KJV):

"Do all things without murmurings and disputings: That ye may be blameless and harmless, the sons of God, without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, among whom ye shine as lights in the world."

Let us now look at the AST:

"Do all things separate from murmurers and disputers, in order that you may be perfect in our kind: pure-blooded and nonmongrelized, faultless children of God amidst a race perverse and having been corrupted, among whom we appear like luminaries in the orderly arrangement."

Do is translated for the Greek word ποιεῖτε (poieite), root word ποιέω (poieo), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to make, produce, ... create, to beget, to produce, to grow, to raise ... to make a person one's son, i.e., to adopt him as son." Originally, we had proposed translating this occurrence as "parent children separate from murmerers..."; however, in light of the fact that *all things* is a separate word (πάντα [panta]), we decided to translate with the typical translation of *do*. Of course, *do all things* includes *parenting children*, which is connoted by use of this word.

The words *in order that* are translated for ἵνα (ina), which is defined by Liddell and Scott simply as "in order that." The phrase *you may be* is translated for γένεσθε (genesthe). There

are two connotations of this word. Liddell Scott Jones states that γένεσθε (genesthe) is a derivative of γιγνομαι (gignomai), which is defined as "to become, to be born..." etc. and is commonly used to describe *birthing*. A search of this word shows that it is often used in the context *birthing* or *becoming sons*, particularly in the New Testament. It has been translated as *you may be* in the AST to avoid undue debate.

Γένεσθε (Genesthe) may actually be a combination of the words γενες (genes) and θε (the), and so we are not talking about one word, as assumed by Mr. James Strong and others, but in reality two distinct words. Γενες (genes) is a poetical prefixion of the word γένος (genos), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "race, stock descent, to be of divine descent, species." Furthermore, the word θε (the) is a suffixal form of the word θεν (then) which, according to Liddell and Scott, means: "motion from, from heaven." θε (the) is a synonym of ἐκ (ek) and means, according to Liddell and Scott: "out of, from forth, arising from, through."

Therefore, rendering γένεσθε (genesthe) as *they may come into the divine race* is a well supported alternative translation for anyone who would actually take the time to check the Greek. However, since neither can be proven for certain, the less controversial translation has been followed in the AST.

The words *perfect in our kind* are translated for ἄμεμπτος (amemptos) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "not to be blamed, blameless, without reproach, blameless, perfect in its kind."

The next word in the verse is the subject of this chapter – ἀκέραιος (akeraios). In our translation of this verse the word ἀκέραιος (akeraios) has been more accurately translated as *pure-blooded* and *nonmongrelized*. We might also add the phrase *free from that which is incompatible*. This translation of the word has been based upon Liddell and Scott's definition: "unmixed, pure: pure in blood, incorrupt, unharmed, unravaged, inviolate, untouched." Bauer says: "pure, innocent, unmixed." Berry says: "unmixed." Thayer says: "unmixed, pure, without admixture." The Analytical Greek Lexicon says: "unmixed, without mixture." There is an older spelling of the word

ἀκέραιος (akeraios) which is not found in either the New Testament or the Septuagint. This word is ἀκέραστος (akerastos) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "Lat. *integer*, unmixed, pure, free from a thing, not to be mixed, incompatible." Yet another spelling of ἀκέραιος (akeraios) is ἄκρατος (akratos), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "unmixed, pure, sheer, unadulterate." Ἄκρατος (Akratos) is the most common spelling of ἀκέραιος (akeraios) in non-Biblical documents, with many usages in Philo, Josephus, and others.

We note in the above definitions that the Latin equivalent of this word is given as *integer*. This word is defined by Cassell's as, "unmixed, pure."

The Greek word ἀκέραιος (akeraios) is the opposite of κεράννυμι (kerannumi), which means according to Liddell and Scott: "to mix, mingle, to mix one's self, mixed half and half, to blend together, to mix, compound, mingled with the race." Walter Bauer gives the following definition for ἀκέραιος (akeraios): "pure, innocent, lit. [literally] unmixed." Since ἀκέραιος (akeraios) is the opposite of κεράννυμι (kerannumi) then ἀκέραιος (akeraios) carries the opposite meanings of κεράννυμι (kerannumi) thus, *unmixed, pure-blooded, unmingled, not mixed in race*. As we have shown, there is a clear foundation for translating ἀκέραιος (akeraios) in this passage as *pure-blooded and nonmongrelized, free from that which is incompatible*. All of these connotations are found in Liddell and Scott's definitions of the words under consideration, and are fully supported by this contextual usage. The physical connotations of ἀκέραιος (akeraios) are strongly accentuated since the verse was begun with the word γένεσθε (genesthe) and the prior verse with ποιεῖτε (poieite), both of which imply birthing and thus demand a physical interpretation.

One rather rare usage of the word ἀκέραιος (akeraios) occurs in Philo's *The Embassy to Gaius* 334, which reads in F.H. Colson's translation:

> "Nevertheless the concession thus granted by him was not *unmixed* but had blended with it a very grave cause for

alarm."

In this citation, ἀκέραιος (akeraios) is not modified by a physical term, and thus merely carries the meaning of unmixed. It is interesting to note from F.H. Colson's translation that most non-Biblical, non-physical usages of ἀκέραιος (akeraios) have been translated correctly, such as in this translation with the word *unmixed*. At the same time it is important to note that F.H. Colson's translation was done in this era, and *unmixed* is merely a modern way of saying *genuine* or *sincere*, as we note in the following verse discussing *harmless*, *sincere*, and *genuine*. Notice also that Philo used the word opposed to the concept of *blending* or *mixing*.

We also find an occurrence of ἀκέραιος (akeraios) in I Clement 21:7, where it was translated by Kirsopp Lake as *purity*. Other occurrences include: Ignatius to Polycarp 2:2; I Clement 2:5 (where it is made clear by Clement that ἀκέραιος (akeraios) and εἰλικρινής (eilikrines), a word dealt with subsequently, are synonymous); Epictetus 3:23, 15; Epistle of Aristeas 31, 264; Plato's Republic, Book III, 409A; Homer's Odyssey 9:205; and several occurrences in Josephus.

The word following ἀκέραιος (akeraios) in Philippians 2:15 is ἄμεμπτοι (amemptoi) which is translated as *faultless*. This word is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "unblamed, blameless."

Immediately after this phrase we find a contrast in the words γενεᾶς σκολιᾶς καὶ διεστραμμένης (geneas skolias kai diestrammenes). These words have been translated as *a race perverse and having been corrupted*. We find in this the clearest contrast between mongrelization and ἀκέραιος (akeraios) or *pure-blooded*.

The next New Testament usage of ἀκέραιος (akeraios) is in Matthew 10:16 which reads in the King James:

"Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore wise as serpents, and harmless as doves."

In this verse there is no modifier such as γένεσθε (genesthe) as in Philippians 2:15, which affects ἀκέραιος (akeraios) in such a way as to demand a physical treatment. It would be correctly translated just by rendering ἀκέραιος (akeraios) *pure* instead of *harmless* as the King James has translated it. The phrase is metaphorical, in that most all doves of the time were *white*, and so you could say *pure white* in a metaphorical sense. The rest of the verse is translated fairly correct in the King James. Using the term *harmless* is totally absurd. No respected scholar ever implied that ἀκέραιος (akeraios) carried the meaning of *harmless*.

This verse is translated in the AST as follows:

> **"Behold, I send you out as sheep in the midst of wolves. Therefore, be wise as serpents and pure as doves."**

Before going on with the exploration of this word and the other synonymous words in the next eleven sections, it becomes important to understand what is meant by *pure* and discuss other synonymous English terms.

Pure. The word *pure* is derived from the Latin word *purus*, which is defined by Cassell's New Latin Dictionary as: "clean, pure, without addition, simple, plain, unadulterated, upright, pure, undefiled, pure, faultless, clear." What we find in this definition is a list of words that have been used in translation to describe a common concept, that of *pure*, whether in a physical or moral sense. We see that the words *unadulterated, simple, undefiled, plain* and *faultless* are all words that have been romanticized since the task of translating the Bible into English began centuries ago, and are now or are becoming euphemistic, unimportant terms without meaning or a clear definition. These words are vague and without actual relevance in the circumstances of the modern experience. Other words not mentioned in Cassell's definition that have a synonymous meaning with these English words are *sincere* and *genuine*.

Some of the most revealing Greek words discussed in this

work which convey the concept of *racially pure* came to be represented by the Latin term *integer*. It is from this word, integer, that we get the English word integrity, a term that conveys *completeness, wholeness, purity, undefiledness,* and *uncorruptedness*. The Latin word *integer* is defined by Cassell's as: "complete, whole, entire, intact, unspoilt, pure, innocent." Words like *incorrupt* and *innocent* fall into this same category. Our concept of *gentleman* is, at the present time, mistaken as well. The word *gentleman* was used in Middle English to describe a person of *noble blood* or *high breeding* and *racial purity*, and first came into vogue due to mistranslations of the Bible using the term *harmless* and thus *gentle* to describe *racial purity*.

At the time of the translation of the King James Version these words were known to represent a common concept, that of *pure*, and connoted racial purity in the minds of the hearers and readers.

We have dealt with the etymological development of many of these words throughout this book in order to more clearly explain definitions given by our quoted scholars and relay the concepts as they understood and used them into modern English. Most all of our quoted scholars' works are older than 1900, and in the period of time since then we have seen such words as *gay* totally change in meaning. This definition-changing is more common than just a singular example such as *gay*; it also includes many common words that most people assume they understand. *Girl*, for example, was used for a child of either sex in Middle English, while today, in Modern English, the term is used only for the female sex. It is today even more reaching than childhood, as it is commonly used for adult females as well.

Archbishop Richard Chenevix Trench wrote entire volumes on the subject of English words "used formerly in senses different from their present meanings," and said that his work was "a contribution, I am aware a very slight one." Many thousands of terms have had a drastic change in meaning over the past fifteen hundred years that the English language has been in use. It is a continuing process, some of it

naturally and some of it by design.

As Webb Garrison stated,

> "... language is fluid and not static... Hundreds of words that were current just three centuries ago are obsolete, archaic, or so radically altered that earlier connotations are known only to scholars and specialists... The shades of meaning in first century Greek are now known far more accurately than they were during the Elizabethan era" (Strange Facts About the Bible, pgs. 271-272).

Thus, careful scrutiny must be given to definitions of Greek words that were written well over a hundred and fifty years ago, and even more scrutiny given to the early translation such as the King James. Often, what is assumed at first glance is far from the truth. With this in mind, we now look at the words *harmless*, *sincere*, and *genuine*, all of which have been used to translate and define ἀκέραιος (akeraios).

Harmless, Sincere, Genuine. The Greek scholars who have given the word *harmless* in their definitions of ἀκέραιος (akeraios) were influenced by the King James Version, and did not arrive at their definitions objectively. The King James Version originally used the word *harmless*, according to Archbishop Richard Chenevix Trench, because of a mistaken etymology equating ἀκέραιος (akeraios) with ἀκέρατος (akeratos); and derived this word from the negative α (a) and κερας (keras) which means "without horn, to push or to hurt," and mistakenly translated it as *harmless*. But not all of the King James Version translators at the time were in agreement with the rendition of the word ἀκέραιος (akeraios) as *harmless*. For this reason we find in the marginal notes the word *sincere*, which was at that time understood to be synonymous with *genuine*, which was known to mean *pure*, or *unmixed*.

Trench, a recognized scholar of archaic Middle English, points out that "the early English use of *sincere* meant *unmixed, unadulterated*." In his book *Glossary of English Words*, he says of '*sincere*':

"The etymology of [Lat.] 'sincerus' being uncertain, it is impossible to say what is the primary notion of our English 'sincere.' It and 'sincerity' no less belong now to an ethical sphere exclusively; but the absence of foreign admixture which they predicate might be literal once."

We find evidence of the literality of the term in Feltham's book *A Brief Character of the Low Countries*, p. 59, which states: "The Germans are a people that more than all the world, I think, may boast sincerity, as being for some thousands of years a pure and unmixed people." In fact, the word *German* derives from the Latin *germanus*, which is defined by Cassell's as, "having the same parents, genuine, real, true."

In addition to this, the word *sincere* is, as Trench stated, derived from the Latin word *sincerus*, which is equivalent to the Greek word ἄδολος (adolos) a synonym of ἀκέραιος (akeraios) and discussed elsewhere in this book.[3] However, one aspect that Trench does not pursue is that of the undue influence exercised by "Queen" James[4] through his appointed overseer of the translation teams and the ruthless attempts of the overseers to make the Authorized Version "conform."

Richard Bancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, in drafting the fifteen regulations that governed the translating of the King James, said in his first regulation: "The ordinary Bible read in the Church, commonly called the Bishops' Bible, to be followed, and as little altered as the truth of the original will admit." He said also, in his fourteenth regulation: "These translations to be used when they agree better with the text than the Bishops' Bible: Tyndale's, Matthew's, Coverdale's, Whitchurch's, Geneva." Thus, the King James Version was

---

[3] See Chapter III.

[4] Geddes MacGregor in his book A Literary History of the Bible, on page 172, says of "Queen" James: "James had all a woman's vanity ... James, however, seemed to them a pedantic Scot with the mentality of a French harlot. No wonder it was whispered that King Elizabeth had been succeeded by Queen James."

primarily based on older versions, most of which had been translated from a Latin New Testament text that was in itself a bad translation of the Greek. Therefore, it becomes necessary to find out that the Latin term *sincerus* means: "pure, unmixed, whole, sound, genuine." The word *genuine* is from the Latin *merus* which means "pure, unmixed."[5]

The last New Testament occurrence of ἀκέραιος (akeraios) is in Romans 16:19, which reads in the King James Version:

> **"For your obedience is come abroad unto all men. I am glad therefore on your behalf: but yet I would have you wise unto that which is good, and simple concerning evil."**

The second part of this verse reads in the AST:

> **"But I desire you to be truly wise as to that which is good in its kind, and remaining pure-blooded from that which is bad in its kind."**

The words *good in its kind* are translated for ἀγαθός (agathos) which means, according to Liddell and Scott: "good in its kind." The words *pure-blooded* are translated for ἀκέραιος (akeraios) which, as stated before, means, according to Liddell and Scott: "unmixed, pure: pure in blood, incorrupt, unharmed, unravaged, inviolate, untouched" and "well born, gentle, in political sense, aristocrats."

The words *that which is bad in its kind* are translated for κακός (kakos) which means, according to Liddell and Scott: "bad in its kind." The word *remaining* is translated for εἰς (eis). We have in this verse a contrast between ἀγαθός (agathos) and κακός (kakos) which all scholars agree are antonyms, or exact opposites. One means *good in its kind*, the other means *bad in its kind*.

The only other usage of the word ἀκέραιος (akeraios) in the Bible is in the Septuagint. This usage is found in Esther

---

[5] Both Latin references from Cassell's New Latin Dictionary.

8:13, a part of Esther that was dropped out by the Masoretic Jews to hide the following and many other racial references.There are over eighty-eight verses in the Septuagint Esther[6] that are not in the Masoretic Text version of Esther. The oldest copy of the Hebrew Masoretic Text is from 1050 AD. When compared to the Septuagint, the Masoretic Text lacks many racial passages found not only in Esther, but almost every other book of the Old Testament as well. The Masoretic Text was compiled by the same people who compiled the Talmud 700 years earlier, and who were known as the Talmudists shortly before they became known as the

---

[6] "Since some skeptical persons are willing to discard this book of Esther as no true history; and even our learned and judicious Dr. Law in his late posthumous critical note upon all the other Hebrew books of the Old Testament, gives us none upon the Canticles or upon Esther, and seems thereby to give up this book, as well as he gives up the Canticles, as indefensible; I shall venture to say, that almost all the objections against this book of Esther are gone at once, if, as we certainly ought to do, and as Dean [Humphrey] Prideaux has justly done, we place this history under Artaxeres Longimanus, as do both the Septuagint interpreters and Josephus" (William Wiston in a footnote of his translation of Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews XI, 6).

There is in the Greek, (according to Erwin Nestle and Kurt Aland in their Novum Testamentum Graece) a New Testament allusion of the Septuagint version of Esther in Mark 6:23, making reference to Esther 5:3 and 7:2. Philo makes mention and quotes from the book of Esther without any doubt as to its origin. Josephus quotes very large portions of Esther, once again without question as to its origin. Origen, the third century Septuagint expert, accepts the book of Esther. In fact, it was accepted by all early Church Fathers, including Clement of Alexandria, who quotes it on at least two occurrences (I Clement LV:6-Esther 7; 4:16), and it is referred to in the Martydom of Polycarp (VIII:1). This was the status quo up until the time of Jerome who, by his own admission, was greatly influenced by the Talmudic Jews. These Jews persuaded him to dismiss not only Esther, but raise doubt of the validity of the so-called Apocrypha; and raise unfounded doubt as to the validity of the books of Chronicles. When the Septuagint version of Esther is examined, it is found to be exceptional in its insight as to the racial composition of the Israelites in Dispersion. We also find it to be historically accurate, which has now been proven through the science of archaeology.

Masoretes.[7]

Esther 8:13 is contained within a bracketed portion in Brenton's translation, and is not numbered as a traditional verse. It should be noted that the following line comes in the early paragraph of Esther 8:13 (Esther 8(E):6 NETS), which reads in Brenton's translation:

"While men, by the false sophistry of an evil disposition, have deceived the simple candour of the ruling powers."

A more correct translation of this verse reads:

"While men, by the false and unsound argument of a character of those bad in their kind, have overcome the racially pure whiteness of the ruling powers."

Once again we have translated the word κακός (kakos) according to Liddell and Scott's definition: *bad in its kind*. We have translated ἀκέραιος (akeraios), our subject word, as *racially pure* in this passage. The word *white* is what Brenton translated as *candour* and is from the Greek word εὐγνωμοσύνην (eugnomosunen) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "the conduct or character of an εὐγνώμον [eugnomon], candour." This is the only occurrence of this word in either the New or Old Testaments. Thus, we look at the word *candour*.

Candour. The word *candour* would seem to be the correct rendering of this word, but what did the word *candour* mean to Brenton and Liddell and Scott in the early nineteenth century? We can assume that both Brenton and Liddell and Scott would have had a working knowledge of the Greek as well as the Latin. They would have certainly known that the

---

[7] For more information on the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint, please see Appendix 2: Septuagint vs. Masoretic Text, contained herein. An exhaustive study on the subject is available by David Tate entitled The Septuagint vs. The Masoretic Text.

word *candour* is from the Latin word *candor*, which is defined by Cassell as: "dazzling white color, whiteness, sincerity, simplicity," and that it is related to the word *caneo* which is defined by Cassell as: "to be white." We find also in Cassell's definition of *candor* the words *sincerity* and *simplicity*, which as we have discussed elsewhere, carry a connotation of *purity* and *racial purity*. Therefore, the Latin word *candor* carried the connotation of *pure white*.

Even in our modern dictionaries, specifically *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*, the English word *candour* is defined as: "to shine, be white, whiteness, unstained purity, and innocence." In addition to this, the word *candid* is synonymous with *candour* and is defined by *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* as: "white, clean, pure." By the popularization of the television show *Candid Camera*, produced by the New York Jew Allen Funt, the word *candid* has come to be understood for its modern definition as a photographic term, which is defined by *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* as: "relating to photography or other presentation or recording of subjects acting naturally, informally, or spontaneously without being posed, rehearsed, or inhibited."

Many other English words are built upon the word *candid*, such as the word *candidate*. *Candidate*, according to *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*, comes from the Latin word *candidatus*, meaning *clothed in white*, and was used of Roman Senators being clothed in white robes. Other English words related to this concept are: *candle*, or *white light*; *candescent*, or *dazzling white*; *candent*, or *white* or *glowing from great heat*. Even our English word *candy* has its origin from another English word, *candied*, and described something being coated in white sugar. Thus, we find the usage of the word *white* in this passage to have overwhelming support not only from the Greek and Latin, but also from the history of the English language as well.

II

SRN 172 ἄκακος-akakos

The Greek word ἄκακος (akakos), pronounced *a´-kak-os*, occurs twice in the New Testament (Romans 16:18, Hebrews 7:26) and, depending on the text you use, around seventeen times in the Septuagint (Job 2:3, 8:20, 36:5; Psalms 24 (25): 21; Proverbs 1:4, 1:22, 2:21, 8:5, 13:7, 14:15, 15:10, 15:23, 21:11; Wisdom 4:12; Jeremiah 11:19). We shall look first at Hebrews 7:26 (KJV):

"For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens."

Let us now look at this verse in the AST:

"For such a High Priest was appropriate for us: sacred, good in kind and pure, nonmongrelized, separated from failures, and becoming higher than the heavens."

The phrase *was appropriate* is translated for ἔπρεπεν (eprepen) , a derivative of πρέπω (prepo), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to be like, resemble, to become, beseem, suit, it is fitting, it beseems." The word sacred is translated for the word ὅσιος (hosios), which is defined by Bauer as, "devout, pious, pleasing to God," and by most scholars as "sacred" or "holy." Liddell and Scott give the following definition: "sanctioned or approved by the law of nature, as opposed to δίκαιος [dikaios]-established by human law." The words *good in kind and pure* are translated for ἄκακος (akakos)—the subject word of this article. The word ἄκακος (akakos) is the opposite of κακός (kakos) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "bad, ill, evil, bad in its kind, of low birth, mean, vile." Another word that is the opposite of κακός (kakos), thus

making it a synonym of ἄκακος (akakos), is καθαρός (katharos) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "clean, pure, spotless, clear, open, free, cleanhanded, pure, clean, free from guilt or defilement, pure, unmixed, bright, clear, pure, unadulterated, without blemish in its kind, spotless, faultless, to be of pure blood."[8] The meaning of κακός (kakos) changed between the time of its usage in the Septuagint and the time of its usage in the New Testament. When used in the Septuagint, according to Liddell and Scott, it generally meant *evil, bad, wicked, ill, mischief, or unlucky*. However, by the first century, it developed into a classification for people. Thus, *bad* and *wicked* became a type or classification for certain kinds of people, much like the New and Old Testament word *Belial*.[9]

This first century usage of κακός (kakos) allowed the Greek speaking population of Palestine to sum up the character and racial classification of individuals by the employment of this one word. Thus, it was said of this class of people that they were *bad in their kind* or *bad by birth*, connoting the idea of a person *not racially pure*, or of a corrupted status when regarding a person's racial condition. It was also employed to connote a corrupted mentality, belief system, or philosophy that was in opposition to the racial laws of Israel and nature.

Therefore, our subject word ἄκακος (akakos) carried the opposite meaning of κακός (kakos). It is the same word with the addition of α (alpha), placed in front to denote negation, ἀ-κακός (a-kakos). This is one of the ways the Greek language denoted an opposite or negative meaning. Therefore, what we are really talking about is the positive and negative meanings of the same word. Although the words ἄκακος (akakos) and κακός (kakos) carried opposite meanings, it must be remembered that the two words were coined some six hundred years before their New Testament usages, and they evolved separately into somewhat different, yet still opposite,

---

[8] See Chapter VIII, SRN 2513 καθαρος-katharos.

[9] See Appendix I: Belial.

meanings. For example, κακός (kakos) can be used of *both* a *racially pure person*, implying pure of body but with a mentality associated with non-Adamics (non-white), or it can be used of non-whites to denote that they are, in fact, not Adamic – both mentally and physically, depending on the context of the word's usage. Therefore, κακός (kakos) could be used to describe a mental condition and/or a physical condition.

On the other hand, ἄκακος (akakos) in its Biblical usages, is used only of an Adamic person and is always employed to denote that a person is racially pure, and the word is never used of non-Adamics. We know that all New Testament usages of ἄκακος (akakos) are in reference to racially pure Adamites, and the word generally carries the meaning of *racially pure, good in its kind, good by birth, unwicked, genuine, unsoiled.*

In our subject verse, the word *nonmongrelized* is translated for ἀμίαντος (amiantos), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "undefiled, pure." The word *defilement*, according to *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*, means "pollution." In addition to this, the opposite and root word of ἀμίαντος (amiantos) is μιασμός (miasmos), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "strictly to paint over a white body with another color, hence to stain, dye, to stain, defile, soil, esp. with blood, to taint, defile, pollute, murder." Here we find, in clear and explicit language, the meaning of this word–*to stain, defile, soil, especially blood*, and let us remember the word *defile* means *to pollute*. Thus, μιασμός (miasmos) literally means to pollute blood and the act of polluting blood is to race-mix, amalgamate, or mongrelize. Μιασμός (miasmos) had come to be used to describe the act of an artist changing the color or coloring over a white statue, or any physical activity of changing the color white to a darker color, and this included race-mixing. This word was consistently employed to denote either the *act of race-mixing* or the *product of race-mixing*, in both the Septuagint and the New Testament. We notice also that the word μιασμός (miasmos) carried the meaning *to taint, pollute, and murder*. It is interesting to note that race-mixing was associated with murder, for in truth it is the act of genocide to

both participating races.

Thus, since ἀμίαντος (amiantos) is the opposite of μιασμός (miasmos), then it can only mean *not polluted, not adulterated, not tainted, and blood not polluted*; therefore, *race not adulterated*, or in modern English, it can be summarized in the word – nonmongrelized (See Chapter XII, SRN ἀμίαντος-amiantos in this book).

The only other New Testament usage of the word ἄκακος (akakos) is in Romans 16:18:

"For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple."

The word ἄκακος (akakos) is translated as *simple* in the King James Version of this verse. The English word *simple* also appears in the following verse in the King James Version (Romans 16:19), but the King James is misleading, because the Greek is actually two different Greek words, which they translated as *simple*. In fact, the word *simple* in the next verse is ἀκέραιος (akeraios) which we dealt with in Chapter 1 of this book. However, the fact that the Apostle Paul used these two different Greek words to describe the same people testifies very clearly that they were understood by the inspired writer to be synonyms. It therefore becomes necessary to look at the definition of ἀκέραιος (akeraios) and try to gain a more precise understanding as to the meaning of ἄκακος (akakos).

ἀκέραιος (akeraios), according to Liddell and Scott, means: "unmixed, pure: pure in blood, incorrupt, unharmed, unravaged, inviolate, untouched." With this in mind, we note that there is an older spelling of the word ἀκέραιος (akeraios), which is not found in either the New Testament or Septuagint. This word is ἀκέρασστος (akerastos), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "unmixed, pure, free from a thing, not to be mixed, incompatible." Ακέραιος (akeraios) is the opposite of κεράννυμι (kerannumi), which means, according to Liddell and Scott: "to mix, mingle, to mix one's self, mixed half and half, to blend together, to mix, compound, mingled with the

race." Since ἀκέραιος (akeraios) is the opposite of κεράννυμι (kerannumi), then it also carried the opposite meaning. Thus, it literally means *unmixed, pure-blooded, unmingled, nonmongrelized*. Therefore, it is evident that ἄκακος (akakos) and ἀκέραιος (akeraios) were understood at the time of the writing of Romans to mean the same thing, and therefore the two words were used as synonyms of one another. This verse is no doubt more accurately rendered with ἄκακος (akakos) translated as *the racially pure*, and not as *simple* as in the King James Version.

The word *simple* was used by the King James translators in Romans 16:18 because, at that time, it conveyed a different meaning in common language than it does today. The word was, in 1611, an English euphemism that denoted *purity*. At the time, their limited understanding of the Greek language persuaded them to believe that the word *simple* would do justice to this concept inasmuch as race-mixing was an abhorrence and an unthinkable act. Race-mixing was understood not only to be against the laws of God, but the laws of nature as well. At that time, it was thought that anything *pure* (racially or otherwise) was *simple*, because it was composed of one ingredient, and that anything *impure* or *mixed* was complex or multifaceted in that it consisted of two or more ingredients, such as black and white. Even one of the modern definitions of *simple* is "pure, free from guile" (*Webster's Third New International Dictionary*). The concept of guile has changed since 1611 as well. In the KJV, the word translated as guile is the Greek word δολόω (doloo) which means, according to Liddell and Scott, "to beguile, ensnare, take by craft, to make deceitful, counterfeit, adulterate, to stain, dye." Thus, even the word *simple* was understood to mean *pure* in 1611.[10]

Thus, Romans 16:18 reads in the AST:

"For such ones do not serve our Master, the Anointed, but their bellies, and through smooth speech and flattery,

---

[10] See Chapter IV: ἁπλόος (haploos) for a further discussion of simple.

they deceive the hearts of the racially pure."

The first Septuagint usage of ἄκακος (akakos) that we shall look at is in Job 2:3, which reads in Brenton's translation:

> **"And the Lord said to the devil, Hast thou then observed my servant Job, that there is none of men like him, a harmless, true, blameless, godly man, abstaining from all evil? and he yet cleaves to innocence, whereas thou hast told me to destroy his substance without cause?"**

Let us now look at a more accurate and literal translation of this verse:

> **"And the Master said to the Diabolical One, Have you not observed My servant Job, that there is none like him, a man that is racially pure, truthful, blameless, godly, keeping away from all things that are bad in their kind, and cleaving to the racially pure? Whereas you have told Me to destroy his substance without reason?"**

The words *racially pure* herein are translated for ἄκακος (akakos), our subject word. The word *blameless* is translated for the word ἄμεμπτος (amemptos) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "not to be blamed, blameless, without reproach, blameless, perfect in its kind." Ἄμεμπτος (amemptos) is also used in Philippians 2:15.[11] The words bad in their kind are translated for the word κακός (kakos), which we discussed earlier in this chapter and which means according to Liddell and Scott: "bad, ill, evil, bad in its kind, of low birth, mean, vile." Finally, the second racially pure in this verse is translated for ἀκακίᾳ (akakia), a form of ἄκακος (akakos) which has the same meaning.

Let us now examine Job 8:20, which reads according to Brenton's translation:

---

[11] See Chapter I: SRN 185 ἀκέραιος (akeraios).

"For the Lord will by no means reject the harmless man; but he will not receive any gift of the ungodly."

Let us now look at a more accurate and literal translation of this verse:

"For the Master will not reject the unmongrelized, but He will not receive any gift of the godless."

Brenton's translation of this verse was fairly good, except for the fact that he added in the word *man* and mistranslated our subject word ἄκακος (akakos) as *harmless*, which we have rendered in our translation *unmongrelized*. The reason he used the word *harmless* is because it was frequently used by the King James Version translators for words carrying the meaning of *racially pure*, all of which started with a mistaken etymology for the word ἀκέραιος (akeraios), which has since been proven invalid.[12]

Although our subject word ἄκακος (akakos) was used seventeen times in the Septuagint, time and space will not permit a further explanation of these occurrences. We therefore shall have to content ourselves with one more example of its usage. The next and last Septuagint occurrence that we shall deal with is found in Job 36:5, which reads in Brenton's translation:

"But know that the Lord will not cast off an innocent man: being mighty in strength of wisdom."

Now let us look at a more accurate translation:

"But know that the Master will not reject the racially pure, being powerful, forceful of heart."

This verse is very similar to Job 8:20, discussed previously

---

[12] See Chapter I: SRN 185 ακεραιος-akeraios.

in this chapter, inasmuch as they convey the same principle of *racially pure acceptance*. It need herein only be said that in this verse the word ἄκακος (akakos) was translated as *innocent* in Brenton's translation and *racially pure* in our translation. Also in Brenton's translation, the word καρδία (kardia) was rendered as *wisdom*, while in our translation it was rendered *heart*, and is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "heart."

In this verse we find the word *innocent* used to express a racial concept. This is because at the time of Brenton's translation, the word *innocent* meant "blameless, pure, untainted," according to *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*. In addition to this, the word *innocent* is from the Latin word *innocuus* which carried the connotation of *pure, blameless*.

III

SRN 97 ἄδολος-adolos

Ἀδολος (adolos), which is pronounced *a´-do-los*, occurs once in the New Testament (I Peter 2:2) and once in the Septuagint (Wisdom of Sol. 7:13). Let us look first at our New Testament occurrence of this word in I Peter 2:2 (KJV), which reads:

"As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby."

Ἀδολος (adolos) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "without fraud, unmixed, pure." In the Koine Greek, or common Greek, it could be used to describe either something in the physical sense or in the intangible sense of thoughts or ideas, depending upon how it was employed in its context. It denoted *purity*, either of something physical or of thought and reason. On the other hand, δολόω (doloo), which is the opposite of ἄδολος (adolos), is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to beguile, ensnare, take by craft, to make deceitful, counterfeit, adulterate, to stain, dye."

In order to understand the definition of δολόω (doloo) correctly, as it relates to ἄδολος (adolos), we must first define the word *adulterate*. *Adulterate* is from the Latin word *adultero*. It becomes important to know what the English word *adulterate* means, and also what it meant in 1846 when Liddell and Scott were published. *Adulterate* was understood to mean then, as it does now, "to pollute, defile, to corrupt, debase, or make impure by the addition of a foreign or a baser substance" (*Webster's Third New International Dictionary*). With this in mind, we are more than justified to define δολόω (doloo) as *to pollute, adulterate, render impure, either of physical objects, bodies, ideas, or rational thought, to corrupt a race, to corrupt an idea, to defile, to debase, to stain, to dye.*

Thus, ἄδολος (adolos), our subject word and the opposite

of δολόω (doloo), must be defined as *pure, unmixed, free of racial adulteration, undefiled, unstained, unpolluted, uncorrupted, completely pure, undyed.* This word, like δολόω (doloo), must logically carry both a physical and a spiritual connotation. This is explicitly implied in its Biblical usage, since it is used to describe the purity of both physical objects as well as systems of thought.

In addition to this, the word that the King James Version translators used – sincere[13] – is from the Latin *sincerus*. At the time of the translation of the King James Version, *sincere* was known and understood to mean *unmixed* or *pure*. Therefore, this verse would read correctly with *sincere* translated as *pure*, as is the case with the New King James Version and other versions. Obviously, it would be just as correct, in this context, if it were translated *unadulterated*, for here it is used to describe milk, a physical object that is metaphorically in reference to a specific belief system of ideas, or what is called the Christian persuasion.

I Peter 2:2 reads in the AST:

> **"As newborn babes desire the pure, rational milk, that you may grow by it into salvation."**

We also find that ἄδολος (adolos) is associated with καθαρός (katharos)[14] by Philo in *Allegorical Interpretation* I:77, which, in F.H. Colson's translation, reads:

> "For prudence, which he has likened to gold, a substance free from alloy and pure and cleansed by fire and tested and precious, is there in the wisdom of God."

Here, F.H. Colson has translated ἄδολος (adolos) *free from alloy* and καθαρός (katharos) as pure. Colson has tried to make a distinction between the two, because it is impossible to

---

[13] See Chapter I: SRN 185 ἀκέραιος (akeraios) for a discussion of sincere.

[14] See Chapter VIII: SRN 2513 καθαρός (katharos).

describe in English words the Greek concept. However, the terms *free from alloy* and *pure* are synonymous, so even this attempt to distinguish the two words has failed.

It was a very common Alexandrian style, used extensively by Philo, Clement, and others, to list synonymous Greek terms linking them with και (kai), sometimes listing seven or eight terms in this manner, which, as scholars agree, are synonymous. The most literal translation of the two words would be *unmixed and pure.*

The next and last Biblical usage of this word occurs in the Septuagint, in the book of Wisdom 7:13, in reference to the Wisdom of God. Brenton's translation renders this verse:

"I learned diligently, and do communicate her liberally, I do not hide her riches."

Now let us accurately translate this passage directly from the Greek:

"I learn as the unmongrelized, and I share her plentiful riches, not hiding her."

We note that Sir Lancelot Brenton's translation is very poor in this instance, as is so often the case throughout his translation of the Septuagint. In this verse he rearranged the words and translated ἄδολος (adolos) as *diligently.* This rearrangement was done in a poorly orchestrated attempt to hide the racial implications of this verse.

When we examine Liddell and Scott's definition, or any number of other Greek Lexicon's definitions for ἄδολος (adolos), we do not find the term *diligent* or any synonymous concept. We can only conclude that *diligently* was, unquestionably, a fanciful invention of Mr. Brenton's diabolical imagination.

A full context analysis of Brenton's parenthetical translational work, if indeed it can be called that, proves that Mr. Brenton did not respect nor follow, in most cases, any scholarly rules for translation. In fact, it is clear that he simply

did not care what the definitions of the Greek words he translated really were. In case after case he simply pulled his fictional translations out of the blue, and as curious as it may seem, the verses he most blatantly ill-treated are those with racial connotations.

In effect, Mr. Brenton has left his Humanist fingerprints all throughout his fictitious translation. His "work" of concealing the racial truths of the Bible can only be characterized as crimes against the Adamic race.

In this verse, the phrase, *I learn as the unmongrelized* is translated for the Greek words ἄδολος τε ἔμαθον (adolos te emathon). The word ἄδολος (adolos) is, of course, our subject word and is translated as *unmongrelized*. The phrase *and I share her plentiful riches* is translated for the Greek words αφθόνως τε μεταδίδωμι τὸν πλοῦτον αὐτῆς (aphthonos te metadidomi ton plouton autes). The phrase *not hiding her* is translated for the Greek words οὐκ ἀποκρύπτομαι (ouk apokruptomai).

IV

SRN 573 ἁπλόος-haploos

We must preface our remarks on the translation of this word and its occurrences in the Bible with remarks on its spelling. The spelling of ἁπλόος (haploos) used herein has caused some confusion among our readers. The variant used in this chapter is used by most Greek scholars, including Liddell and Scott, and the New Testament spelling has been provided as a second variant by Liddell and Scott. For reference, SRN 573 provides the spelling as ἁπλοῦς (haplous), and does not provide the spelling which will allow the reader to find the root word in a scholarly Greek Lexicon. Likewise, neither SRN 572 ἁπλότης (haplotes), nor SRN 574 ἁπλῶς (haplos), contain this information or the correct spelling of the root word, ἁπλόος (haploos). We have provided herein the *first* spelling variant and the *root* provided by Greek scholars, including Liddell and Scott, so that the reader may be aware of the spelling variant and be able to find the correct root word in most Greek Lexicons.

The historical trend to treat New Testament Greek differently than other Greek has taken root and flourished in our present age, and this has led to the widespread belief in the deceptive teaching that there are specialized and unique definitions for Greek words when they are used in the New Testament. The practices surrounding this word clearly demonstrate this error of fact and practice. Strong and others have attempted to sever New Testament Greek from other Greek language scholarship, and have fostered the ability of deceivers to make up their own "special" definitions for certain Biblical Greek words of their choosing. Conveniently, these "special" definitions are provided not by scholars of Greek, but by "religious" groups, self-described "theologians," and most usually, Talmudic rabbis.

Most New Testament concordances and lexicons, especially those modeled after Strong's, do not provide the

scholarly spelling variant found in Liddell and Scott. We have provided the correct spelling primarily to make finding the root word in Greek lexicons easier for the student, but also to call attention to the false notion that Greek words used in the New Testament have special and different definitions assigned to them. Pseudo-scholars and pulpit liars have spread this false teaching, so that they have taken Greek words with known definitions and applied definitions of their own choosing when they are used in the New Testament. As this book is demonstrating, this deceptive practice has led to the creation of scores of theological euphemisms, which are at best void of meaning, or at worst, twisted to mean something entirely different than when they were first penned down by the Apostles.

The Greek word ἁπλόος (haploos), which is pronounced *hap-looce´*, occurs twice in the New Testament (Matt. 6:22; Luke 11:34) and twice in the Septuagint (Job 22:3; Proverbs 11:25). Some Septuagint manuscripts have more occurrences of this word, but these are the occurrences that are universally accepted by all Septuagint manuscripts. We will look first at Matthew 6:22, which reads in the King James Version:

"The light of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light."

It would be sufficient in this verse to translate the word *single* as *pure*, as in the Anointed Standard Translation:

"The lamp of the body is the eye. Then when your eye is pure, also all your body is light."

Simple, Single, One-fold. The word *pure* is translated for the Greek word ἁπλόος (haploos). The word ἁπλόος (haploos) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "Lat. simplex, onefold, simple, sincere, opp. to compound or mixed." The Analytical Greek Lexicon defines ἁπλόος (haploos) as "purity." In order to fully understand the concepts in these definitions, we shall have to explore their etyma as used at the

time of the compiling of Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon.

As stated previously in this book, the word *simple* was used by many translators and lexicographers contemporary with the KJV because it was thought that anything *pure*, racially or otherwise, was *simple*, in that it was composed of one ingredient, and that anything *impure* or *mixed* was complex or multifaceted, in that it consisted of two or more ingredients, such as black and white. In addition to this, anyone with a working knowledge of Greek, such as a translator or lexicographer must also have a working knowledge of Latin, which means they would have certainly known that the word *simple* is derived from the Latin word *simplex* or *simplus*, defined as: "simple, single, uncompounded, unmixed, pure, guileless, not complicated."

The fact that *simplex* is the Latin equivalent of ἁπλόος (haploos) is stated in Liddell and Scott's definition for ἁπλόος (haploos). This word stood opposed to the Latin word *misceo*, which means "to mix, mingle, to mix, associate combine, to confuse, confound."[15] This too is stated in Liddell and Scott's definition of ἁπλόος (haploos) – "opp. to compound or mixed."

Therefore, *confusion* was associated with *mixing*, while *uncomplicated* was associated with *unmixed, pure, or simple.*

The reader of the King James Version in 1611 would have had no problem understanding that *simple* is a synonymous concept of *unmixed* and *pure*. The same is true with the creators of our Greek lexicons. Most, if not all, were compiled in the late 1700's to early 1800's – a period when language, especially in England, was still archaic from our modern viewpoint. The concept of *simple* to Liddell and Scott, both Englishman, would have been *pure, uncomplex, unmixed.*

Also, in Liddell and Scott's definition of ἁπλόος (haploos) is the concept of *onefold*, as opposed to *two-fold or multifold*. The concept of *multifold* or *two-fold* is expressed in the Latin word *duplex*. *Two-fold* or *multifold* is composed of more than one constituent and is thus *complex*; while *one-fold* is composed of

---

[15] Both Latin references from Cassell's New Latin Dictionary.

only one constituent, and is thus *simple*.

Plato, in his work *Republic*, 361-b, associates the word ἁπλόος (haploos) with γενναῖος (gennaios) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "suitable to one's birth or descent, high blood, noble both in mind and blood, things good in their kind." So, we learn from Plato that ἁπλόος (haploos) is synonymous with, or at least used as a positive attribute of, γενναῖος (gennaios).

Γενναῖος (gennaios) is the root word of two other synonyms dealt with herein – γνήσιος (gnesios) and γνησίως (gnesios).[16] It is inescapable to come to the conclusion that ἁπλόος (haploos) does indeed mean *pure*, to a varying degree, from the concept of *simple and pure*, to the concept of *unmixed and pure*, or *racially pure*. This word is also associated with ἄκακος (akakos) by Plutarch in *De communibus notitiis contra Stoicos*, 48. The word ἄκακος (akakos) is another of the subject synonyms dealt with herein.[17]

The occurrence of ἁπλόος (haploos) in Luke 11:34 is much the same as the occurrence of ἁπλόος (haploos) in Matthew 6:22, although Luke 11:34 combines in one verse what is two verses in Matthew 6:22 and 23. Luke 11:34 reads, (KJV):

"The light of the body is the eye: therefore when thine eye is single, thy whole body also is full of light; but when thine eye is evil, thy body also is full of darkness."

Let us look now at this verse in the AST:

"The lamp of the body is the eye. Therefore, when your eye is pure, also all your body is bright, but when it is evil, also your body is dark."

---

[16] See Chapter X: SRN 1103 γνήσιος (gnesios) and Chapter XI: SRN 1104 γνησίως (gnesios).

[17] See Chapter II: SRN 172 ἄκακος (akakos).

The word *pure*, or *single* as the King James Version has it, is our subject word – ἁπλόος (haploos). The word *evil* is translated for the Greek word πονηρὸς (poneros). Πονηρὸς (poneros) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "causing toil or hardship, hurtful, unlucky, useless, good for nothing, weakly, bad, worthless, knavish, wicked, base, cowardly, like κακός [kakos]," and is usually defined as *evil*. The word πονηρὸς (poneros) has a very large spectrum meaning, and is translated *secundum usum et secundum syntaxes*, that is, *according to usage and according to syntax*. It can mean everything from *physical pain* to *wickedness*, to things *bad in their kind*. Because of its relationship with κακός (kakos), in most New Testament uses the umbrella word *evil* suffices.

Job 22:3 and Proverbs 11:25 contain the two Septuagintal usages of ἁπλόος (haploos). We shall look first at Job 22:3 (Brenton):

"For what matters it to the Lord, if thou wert blameless in thy works? or is it profitable that thou shouldest perfect thy way?"

Let us now discover what this verse really says:

"For what care is it of the Lord if you were blameless in your works? Or what use is it that you should purify your way of thinking?"

The word *blameless* is translated for the Greek word ἄμεμπτος (amemptos) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "not to be blamed, blameless, without reproach, blameless, perfect in its kind." The word *purify* is translated for ἁπλόος (haploos) our subject word. The phrase *way of thinking* is translated for the Greek word ὁδόν (odon) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a way or method: a way of thinking, mode of belief."

The last Biblical usage of ἁπλόος (haploos) is in Proverbs 11:25, which reads (Brenton):

"Every sincere soul is blessed: but a passionate man is not graceful."

Let us now look at a more literal translation of this passage:

"Every racially pure mind is favored: but a man led by passion is not of good outward appearance."

The words *racially pure* in this context are translated for the Greek word ἁπλόος (haploos) – our subject word. The word *mind* is translated for ψυχὴ (psuche) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "the soul, mind, reason, understanding," and this word is actually in reference to a *mentality* or a specific *estate of mind*. In this instance the word *mind* is in reference to an *estate of mind* which can only belong to the racially pure, and is a condition designated in the New Testament as having the Mentality of Separation. In the New Testament AST, we have translated ψυχὴ (psuche) as *life* and provided an Appendix (9) explaining the very difficult meaning of the word ψυχὴ in Koine Greek. However, the Septuagint was written nearly three hundred years before the New Testament and a variety of other translations, including *mind* as herein, are acceptable.

The word *favored* is translated for the Greek word εὐλογέω (eulogeo) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "speak well of; praise; deliver a panegyric upon; honor; bless; praise a God." The words *of good outward appearance* are translated for the Greek word εὐσχήμων (euschemon) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "of good outward bearing, good in outward show."

In conclusion, ἁπλόος (haploos) carries a meaning of *pure*, with a meaning spectrum ranging from *racially pure* to *simplistic, uncomplicated, singleness,* denoting purity of the subject matter and absence of foreign admixture or elements.

V

SRN 572 ἁπλότης-haplotes

Ἁπλότης (haplotes), which is pronounced hap-lot´-tece, occurs seven times in the New Testament (Romans 12:8; II Corinthians, 8:2, 9:11, 9:13, 11:3; Eph. 6:5; Colossians 3:22), one additional time in the Textus Receptus at II Corinthians 1:12, and six times in the Septuagint (II Kings 15:11; I Chronicles 29:17; Wisdom 1:1; I Ma. 2:37, 2:60; III Ma. 3:21). We will look first at Romans 12:8-9, which reads in the King James Version:

> **"Or he that exhorteth, on exhortation: he that giveth, let him do it with simplicity; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness. Let love be without dissimulation. Abhor that which is evil, cleave to that which is good."**

Let us now look at a more accurate and literal translation of these verses in the AST:

> **"Or the one exhorting, in the exhortation; he that shares, let him do it in purity; the one taking the lead in diligence, the one showing mercy in cheerfulness, let honorable brotherly love be undisguised, abhor things bad in kind, cleaving to things good in kind."**

The concept of exhort might also be expressed with the word *summon* based upon Liddell and Scott's definition of the Greek word παρακαλέω (parakaleo), "to call to aid, send for, summon, to call, to cheer on, encourage, exhort, to excite, to demand, require." Under the same principle, the Apostle Paul employed the word παράκλησις (paraklesis) in his letter to the Separated Ones of Philippi, wherein he began his address with these words:

> **"Therefore, if there is any encouragement in the**

Anointed, if any consolation of honorable brotherly love, if any fellowship of the Mentality, if any deep emotions and compassions..." (Philippians 2:1).

Here, παράκλησις (paraklesis) is translated as *encouragement*.

In Romans 12:8-9, we have translated our subject word, ἁπλότης (haplotes), as *purity*. In this instance, the concept is all inclusive, expressing both physical and moral or mental purity. In Liddell and Scott's definition of ἁπλότης (haplotes), we are instructed to refer to this word's derivative, ἁπλόος (haploos). ἁπλόος (haploos) is another of our synonyms which we have already dealt with and exhausted, but for the sake of clarity as to what ἁπλότης (haplotes) means we will recap our findings on ἁπλόος (haploos).

The word ἁπλόος (haploos) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "Lat. simplex, onefold, simple, sincere, opp. to compound or mixed." The Analytical Greek Lexicon defines ἁπλόος (haploos) as "purity." In order to fully understand the concepts expressed in these definitions, we must explore the etyma of the definitions as used at the time of the compiling of Liddell and Scott. As stated previously in this book, the word *simple* was used by many translators and lexicographers contemporary with the KJV because it was thought that anything pure, racially or otherwise, was *simple*, in that it was composed of one ingredient. Anything *impure* or *mixed* was complex or multifaceted in that it consisted of two or more ingredients, such as black and white.

In addition to this, anyone with a working knowledge of Greek, such as a translator or lexicographer, must also have a working knowledge of Latin, which means they would have certainly known that the word *simple* is derived from the Latin word simplex or simplus which is defined as: "simple, single, uncompounded, unmixed, pure, guileless, not complicated." The fact that *simplex* is the Latin equivalent of ἁπλόος (haploos) is stated in Liddell and Scott's definition. This word stood opposed to the Latin word *misceo*, which means "to mix, mingle, to mix, associate combine, to confuse, confound." This

too is stated in Liddell and Scott's definition of ἁπλόος (haploos) – "opp. [opposed] to compound or mixed." Confusion was associated with mixing while uncomplicated was associated with unmixed, pure or simple. The reader of the King James Version in 1611 would have had no problem understanding that *simple* was a synonymous concept of *unmixed and pure.*

The word ἁπλότης (haplotes) is associated with ἀκακία (akakia), a derivative of ἄκακος (akakos) by Philo in *De opifico mundi 170,* connecting the two words with καί (kai), a common practice of Philo. Philo wrote in a very precise language, many times using synonymous terms together to emphasize or strengthen what he was writing. By his association of the word ἁπλότης (haplotes) with ἀκακία (akakia), we learn that indeed the two words are synonymous. Ἀκακία (akakia) is the opposite of κακός (kakos), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "bad, ill, evil, bad in its kind, of low birth, mean, vile." Another word that is the opposite of κακός (kakos), thus making it a synonym of ἀκακία (akakia) and ἁπλότης (haplotes), is καθαρός (katharos) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "clean, pure, spotless, clear, open, free, cleanhanded, pure, clean, free from guilt or defilement, pure, unmixed, bright, clear, pure, unadulterated, without blemish in its kind, spotless, faultless, to be of pure blood."

Thus, we see from Philo that the words ἀκακία (akakia), ἁπλότης (haplotes) and καθαρός (katharos) were all terms sharing the same meaning: that of *pure, unmixed, unadulterated, and to be of pure blood or nonmongrelized.*

The words *brotherly love* in this verse are translated for the Greek word ἀγάπη (agape) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "love, brotherly love." The words *bad in kind,* which is rendered as *evil* in the King James Version, are translated for the Greek word πονηρὸς (poneros). Πονηρὸς (poneros) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "causing toil or hardship, hurtful, unlucky, useless, good for nothing, weakly, bad, worthless, knavish, wicked, base, cowardly, like κακός [kakos]." In Liddell and Scott's definition we see that πονηρὸς

(poneros) is compared with κακός (kakos) as a synonym, and so it becomes necessary to clearly understand the meaning of κακός (kakos). Κακός (kakos) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "bad in its kind." The words *good in kind* are translated for ἀγαθός (agathos) which means, according to Liddell and Scott: "good in its kind." Here we have a perfect example of a word being translated *secundum usum*, that is according to usage. We have translated πονηρὸς (poneros) *bad in kind* based upon its relation with κακός (kakos) because it is immediately contrasted with ἀγαθός (agathos), which we have translated as, and which is defined, as *good in kind*.

The next occurence of ἁπλότης (haplotes) in the Textus Receptus New Testament is in II Corinthians 1:12, which reads in the King James Version:

> **"For our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world, and more abundantly to you-ward."**

However, this occurence of the word ἁπλότης (haplotes), precisely the dative singular ἁπλότητι (haploteti), lacks textual support. Instead, the manuscripts p^{46} ℵ* A B C 33 1739, etc. contain the word ἁγιοτητι (hagioteti), a word differing only by two letters and which sounds very similar in Greek. Thus, the actual word in this verse is ἁγιοτητι (hagioteti), which would be translated *separation* instead of *racial purity* according to the reading of the Textus Receptus. The reading of the Textus Receptus, if true, would be redundant. Let us look at this verse in the AST:

> **"For our boasting is this, the testimony of our conscience, that we behaved in the world in separation and godly racial purity, not in fleshly wisdom, but in the favor of God, and more abundantly toward you."**

Again, the word *separation* is translated for ἁγιοτητι (hagioteti), instead of *racial purity* for our subject word as found in the Textus Receptus. The words *racial purity* are translated for εἰλικρινεία (eilikrineia), another subject word of this book,[18] and which is defined by Liddell and Scott as "examined by the sun's light, tested, found genuine, unmixed, distinct, separate, pure clean, uncorrupted, perfect, entire, distinct." The words *more abundantly* are translated for the Greek word περισσοτέρως (perissoteros), which is defined by Thayer as: "more abundantly, more earnestly."

Our next usage of this word occurs in II Corinthians 8:2, which reads in the King James Version:

"How that in a great trial of affliction the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality."

Let us look now at this verse in the AST:

"That in much testing of trouble, the overflowing of their joy and the depth of their poverty abounded to the riches of their racial purity."

The King James Version's translation of this verse is fairly accurate, except for its archaic language. (See our treatment of the word *liberal* later in this chapter). We have translated our subject word, ἁπλότης (haplotes), as *racial purity* in this verse.

Let us look now at II Corinthians 9:11, which reads in the King James:

"Being enriched in every thing to all bountifulness, which causeth through us thanksgiving to God."

Let us look now at the AST:

---

[18] See Chapter IX: SRN εἰλικρινεία (eilikrineia).

"In everything, you are being enriched in all racial purity, which works out thanksgiving to God through us."

Here the King James Version translators have misconstrued the syntax to try and use the subject word in a non-racial way. The translation of the AST reveals that the subject word is in fact being used as the subject of the sentence, modified by the adjective *all*.

Let us look now at II Corinthians 9:13, which, reads in the King James Version:

"While by the experiment of this ministration they glorify God for your professed subjection unto the gospel of Christ, and for your liberal distribution unto them, and unto all men."

Let us look now at the AST translation of this verse:

"Through the proof of this service, they repute God by your freely expressed submission to the good message of the Anointed and the racial purity of your fellowship toward them and all."

The word *proof* is translated for the Greek word δοκιμῆς (dokimes) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a proof." The words *racial purity* are translated for our subject word, ἁπλότης (haplotes). The word *fellowship* is translated for the Greek word κοινωνίας (koinonias), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "communion, fellowship."

Liberal. In this verse, the King James Version has translated ἁπλότης (haplotes) as *liberal*. This is not the only place where one of our synonyms has been translated as *liberal* or *liberally* or other derivations of the word, especially in the Septuagint by Brenton. Therefore, here we will attempt to examine the reasoning behind this choice of wording by Brenton and the King James Version translators. While the word *liberal* never actually was understood to mean *pure*, it did not carry the same connotation as we understand it today. The

term *liberal* is from the Latin word *liberalis* or *liber* which means according to Cassell's: "relating to freedom, becoming to a freedman, gentlemanlike, free, unrestrained, free from, frankly openly." As we see from this definition, the word *liberty* is also derived from these same Latin words. The word implied *free, free from a thing,* and if it was used of a free-man then it usually implied a *gentleman,* or, in Roman times, a white man, for the word *gentle,* discussed elsewhere in this book, carried the connotation of *pure.* The concept of *free from a thing* also could carry the concept of *pure,* as anything *pure* was *free from something,* be that foreign blood or anything else (whether physical or spiritual); in any case, however, it does imply the concept of *free from.*

The phrase *liberal arts* uses the term *liberal* in the sense of *gentlemanly, high-class,* or *aristocratic* and thus, was generally arts reserved for racially pure white people. In the *Webster's Third New International Dictionary,* definition 1-b, which discusses *liberal arts,* we find this definition: "of, belonging to, or befitting a man of free birth, gentleman in social rank, befitting a free man." Thus, the term *liberal* in Latin and early English at the time of the KJV was a description for those of *high-birth, noble birth, free birth,* and at that time these attributes were indicative of the white aristocracy. The arts of *liberal arts* were those studies conducted by the white aristocracy. When we remember that in our subject verse Paul is talking to the *ecclesia,* or the Body Politic, we begin to understand the important role of racial consciousness in the Christian Church.

We look now at II Corinthians 11:3, which reads in the King James:

"But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ."

Let us look now at a more accurate and literal translation of this verse in the AST:

"But I fear, lest somehow as the serpent seduced Eve,

in his craftiness, in this way your thoughts should be mongrelized away from the racial purity [and the separation] of the Anointed."

Here we find our subject word, ἁπλότης (haplotes), which is translated *racial purity,* contrasted with *mongrelization.* It is also interesting to note that in this verse Paul compares the seduction of Eve with mongrelization. The word seduced is translated for the Greek word ἐξηπάτησεν (exepatesen) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to cheat, seduce."

We note that in the AST translation of this verse, the words *and separation* are in open brackets, indicating equal support for the omission or inclusion of the words in the Greek. The Greek phrase in question is καί τῆς ἁγνότητος (kai tes hagnotetos), which is read in the manuscripts $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ א* B G 33 451 $it^{g,r,61}$ syr^{h} with * $cop^{sa,bo}$ goth eth, but is absent in א^{c} D^{c} H K P Y 614 1739 (please see the AST's footnote regarding this phrase). Since the publication of the AST, the *Biblia Graeca* apparatus has been updated to add, for inclusion, $\mathfrak{P}^{145}$, F, (D 236), 81, 104, and remove 451, along with other changes.

The phrase *should be mongrelized* is translated for the Greek root word φθείρω (phtheiro). This word and two related words, φθαρτός (phthartos) and ἄφθαρτος (aphthartos), are discussed in Appendix 10 of the Anointed Standard Translation, which reads:

"Φθαρτος and Αφθαρτος. These two Greek words, φθαρτος and αφθαρτος, express a conditional concept. They do not express a certain state so much as they express the ability to possess a certain state. Φθαρτος means mongrelizable and implies that an object is able to be mongrelized, whereas αφθαρτος means unmongrelizable which means that the object is not only not mongrelized, but it is not able to be mongrelized. Φθαρτος occurs in the New Testament six times (Romans 1:23; I Corinthians 9:25, 15:53-54; and I Peter 1:18, 23). Αφθαρτος occurs in the New Testament seven times (Romans 1:23; I Corinthians 9:25, 15:52; I Timothy 1:17; I Peter 1:4, 23, 3:4).

"Αφθαρτος is the exact opposite of φθαρτος, being the negated form of the word with the addition of a prefixal Alpha. With this in mind, we can determine the meaning of the one by examining the other, and this we shall do with the word φθαρτος, as the most evidence exists for it because it is the root of the other. Nearly all lexicons, regardless of the word they might give to define φθαρτος, give it in the form of "corruptible" as Berry does. This "-ible" or "-able" suffix indicates that, as we have said earlier, the word is meant to imply the ability to possess the attribute it describes, but not necessarily possessing it.

"Thus, an object described by the word φθαρτος is capable of being mongrelized or capable of mongrelizing but has not necessarily mongrelized or been mongrelized. Let us look now at other definitions given for this word. Most lexicons give the definition of φθαρτος under its immediate root φθειρω, thus, φθειρω is defined by Liddell and Scott as "to corrupt, spoil, ruin, kill; of a maiden, to debauch, deflower her; of colors, to mix together." We learn from this that the word carried a threefold meaning. Initially, we see that it has an overall meaning of corruption or spoiling and ruining something. (It needs to be noted here that in 1846, the time of the writing of Liddell and Scott, when the word corruption was used biologically or physically, it usually implied race-mixing, as the Webster's Third New International Dictionary makes clear in its example of "corruption of blood.")

"Next, in the definition of φθειρω, we see the more specific definition of sexual corruption; the word was used of corrupting young girls through deflowerment and debauchery. Finally, we see that the word in its most specific application was used to describe the mixing of colors. Thus, when used in the proper context, the word could be used of sexual corruption that resulted in mixing of colors. This is just an euphemistic way of saying race-mixing or mongrelization. Remember, however, that this word merely implies that the object under consideration has the ability to be mongrelized or to mongrelize. Upon further investigation, we find the definition of a related word, φθορα, which is given by Liddell and Scott as "seduction, mixing of colors." Here again we see the concept of sexual seduction that results in the mixing of colors or race-mixing. However, more importantly, we find

etymological evidence linking this group of words to other groups of words that are known to mean mongrelization, to mongrelize, etc. In Bauer's definition of φθορα, we find (w. [with] μοιχεια (Philo, Det. Pot. Ins. [Quod deterius potiorp insidiari soleat] 102) 2 Cl [II Clement] 6:4)."

"This means that Philo and Clement used the word φθορα and μοιχεια together in such a way in these passages so as to show that they were synonymous, and μοιχεια, which is commonly translated adultery, without a doubt is defined as mongrelizing, to mongrelize, etc. And μοιχεια has further been connected directly with νοθος through the works of Josephus, and νοθος literally means a mongrel. Thus, once it has been established that φθαρτος literally means mongrelizable then we see that its opposite αφθαρτος literally means nonmongrelizable or unmongrelizable."

Thus, φθείρω (phtheiro) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "To corrupt, spoil, ruin, kill, of a maiden, to debauch, deflower her, colors, to mix together." Notice that this word does not imply the ability, but the actual *state of mongrelizing or being mongrelized.*

We look now at Ephesians 6:5, which reads in the King James Version:

"Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ."

Let us look now at a more accurate and literal translation of this verse in the AST:

"The slaves: obey your masters according to flesh with fear and trembling, in purity of your heart, as to the Anointed."

Here we find that the King James is fairly accurate. With the simple update of the word *singleness* to *pure,* and clarifying the other archaic language of the King James Version, we have an accurate translation.

We look now at the last New Testament usage of our subject word in Colosians 3:22, which reads in the King James Version:

"Servants, obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; not with eyeservice, as menpleasers; but in singleness of heart, fearing God."

We look now at this verse in the AST:

"The slaves: Obey in all things those masters according to the flesh, not with eye-services as men-pleasers, but in purity of heart, fearing God."

The King James Version translation of this verse has more syntax errors than our last verse, but like our last verse with the updating of the word *singleness* to *purity*, we have a fairly accurate translation.

We will look at only two Septuagint usages of ἁπλότης (haplotes) to ascertain the general meaning of the word in the Septuagint, starting with I Maccabees 2:37, which reads, in Brenton's translation:

"But said, let us die all in our innocency, heaven and earth shall testify for us, that ye put us to death wrongfully."

We look now at a more accurate translation:

"And said, let us all die in racial purity, heaven and earth will testify for us, that you put us to death wrongfully."

Here Brenton's translation was generally accurate; however, he has hidden the true meaning of ἁπλότης (haplotes) by translating a word which means *racial purity* using the word *innocency*.

We look now at I Maccabees 2:60, which reads in Brenton's

translation:

"Daniel for his innocency was delivered from the mouth of lions."

We look now at a more accurate translation:

"Daniel for his racial purity was delivered from the mouth of the lions."

Here again, Brenton's translation was generally accurate; however, that does not change the fact that he deliberately hid the true meaning of this word with the term innocency. We learn from these two Septuagint verses that in the Old Testament (Septuagint), even more than in the New Testament, the word ἁπλότης (haplotes) carried strong physical and racial connotations.

VI

SRN 574 ἁπλῶς-haplos

The Greek word ἁπλῶς (haplos), which is pronounced *ha'-ploce,* occurs once in the New Testament (Jacob [James] 1:5) and three times in the Septuagint (Proverbs 10:9; Wisdom 16:27; II Maccabees 6:6). We will look first at Jacob (James) 1:5, which reads in the King James Version:

"If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him."

We look now at this verse in the Anointed Standard Translation:

"But if any of you lack wisdom, let him ask from God Who gives to all in racial purity and Who is not dishonorable, and it will be given to him."

The King James Version translation of this verse is poorly done. We shall have to examine it phrase by phrase. The English phrase *But if any of you lack wisdom* is translated for the Greek words Εἰ δέ τις ὑμῶν λείπεται σοφίας (Ei de tis umon leipetai sophias).

The English phrase *let him ask from God Who gives to all* is translated for the Greek words αἰτείτω παρὰ τοῦ διδόντος θεοῦ πᾶσιν (aiteito para tou didontos Theou pasin).

The English phrase *who are racially pure and not dishonorable* is translated for the Greek words ἁπλῶς καί μὴ ὀνειδίζοντος (haplos kai me oneidizontos). The words *racially pure* are translated for the Greek word ἁπλῶς (haplos), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "adv. from ἁπλόος [haploos], Lat. [Latin] simpliciter, simply, plainly, openly."

We look first at its Latin equivalent, which according to Liddell and Scott, and as we have just stated, is *simpliciter.*

Simpliciter is defined by Cassell's New Latin Dictionary as: "simple, single, uncompounded, unmixed, pure, guileless." In addition to this, we must look at the derivative of ἁπλῶς (haplos). In Liddell and Scott's definition, it says that ἁπλῶς (haplos) is an adverb from ἁπλόος (haploos).

We have dealt with ἁπλόος (haploos) elsewhere in this book, and so here we will only recap its definition. The word ἁπλόος (haploos) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "Lat. [Latin] simplex, onefold, simple, sincere, opp. [opposed] to compound or mixed." In order to gain a better understanding of ἁπλόος's (haploos) definition, please review Chapter IV: SRN 573 ἁπλόος-haploos. Here we will simply say that we proved the meaning of the word ἁπλόος (haploos) to be *purity* or *racial purity*, and that these two words are basically the same word, although as in all translations context matters as to the definition. As stated, ἁπλῶς (haplos) is an adverbial form of ἁπλόος (haploos). It would have been appropriate to list the two words under the heading of ἁπλόος (haploos) as Günter Mayer did and as was done in the Analytical Greek Lexicon, but since Liddell and Scott have handled these words as two different words, we have chosen to separate the two and deal with them more precisely, noting the adverb modifications of ἁπλῶς (haplos). Strong's Concordance also handles these words as two different words.

It should be noted that as this form of the word is adverbial, a proper translation of the Greek would be *in racial purity*, and in this particular usage of the word was not used correctly in a technical sense, but the author may have meant *those who are in racial purity* or, in simple English, *those who are racially pure.*

The word *dishonorable* in the verse under consideration is translated for the Greek word ὀνειδίζοντος (oneidizontos), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "reproachful, disgraceful" and, in our passage under consideration, connotes the concept *dishonoring divine favor*. The English phrase *it will be given to him* is translated for the Greek words καί δοθήσεται αὐτῷ (kai dothesetai auto).

The next usage of ἁπλῶς (haplos) that we shall examine

occurs in Proverbs 10:9, which reads in Brenton's translation:

"He that walks simply, walks confidently, but he that perverts his ways shall be known."

Let us now look at a more accurate and literal translation of this verse:

"He that walks in purity, walks trustingly, but he that perverts his ways shall be known."

Brenton's translation of this verse was fairly accurate and only two changes have been made in ours. The words *purity* are translated for our subject word ἁπλῶς (haplos). The word *trustingly* is translated for the Greek word πεποιθώς (pepoithos) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to trust, rely on." The context here implies a definition of *purity*, or *integrity*.

The next usage of ἁπλῶς (haplos) is in Wisdom 16:27, which reads in Brenton's translation:

"For that which was not destroyed of the fire, being warmed with a little sunbeam, soon melted away:"

We look now at our translation of this passage:

"For that which was not destroyed by fire, simply warmed by a brief beam of the sun, melted down.

For that which was not destroyed by fire is translated for the Greek τὸ γὰρ ὑπὸ πυρὸς μὴ φθειρόμενον (To gar upo puros me phtheiromenon). Here is an instance where the context demonstrates the generic meaning of ἁπλῶς as "simply, plainly," and is applied to the verb θερμαινόμενον (thermainomenon) which means "warm, heat," and thus ἁπλῶς ὑπὸ βραχείας ἀκτῖνος ἡλίου θερμαινόμενον ἐτήκετο (haplos upo bracheis aktinos eliou thermainomenon eteketo) is translated as *simply warmed by a brief beam of the sun, melted*

down.

The next and last Biblical usage of ἁπλῶς (haplos) occurs in II Maccabees 6:6, which reads in Brenton's translation:

"Neither was it lawful for a man to keep sabbath days or ancient feasts, or to profess himself at all to be a Jew."

We look now at a more accurate and literal translation:

"And they could not keep the sabbath, nor preserve the festivals of their forefathers, nor confess themselves to be racially pure Judeans."

Not surprisingly, Brenton has incorrectly translated this verse in the singular throughout, whereas the plural is actually used in the Greek. This is an important distinction, as the plural in this verse is important to accurately determining if ἁπλῶς (haplos) is used as an adjective or an adverb. In Doric Greek, ἁπλῶς (haplos) was used adjectivally in the plural, masculine, accusative. Remember, the Septuagint Greek is older and different than the Koine Greek of the New Testament. Thus, ἁπλῶς (haplos) as an adjective in this verse is likely describing Ἰουδαῖον (Judeans), instead of being used as an adverb and describing *confess*. That would not make as much sense, either in syntax or in content, when we see that II Maccabbees begins with descriptions of the lawlessness, including prostitution and intercourse with non-Judean women. The lesson to be learned is that the purity of the Judeans was being corrupted, religiously as well as racially.

The English phrase *And they could not keep the sabbath* is translated for the Greek words ἦν δ' οὔτε σαββατίζειν (En d oute sabbatizein). The English phrase *nor preserve the festivals of their forefathers* is translated for the Greek words οὔτε πατρῴους ἑορτὰς διαφυλάττειν (oute patroous eortas diaphulattein). The English phrase *nor confess themselves to be racially pure Judeans* is translated for the Greek words οὔτε ἁπλῶς Ἰουδαῖον ὁμολογεῖν εἶναι (oute haplos Ioudaion

omologein einai). The words *racially pure* are translated for our subject word ἁπλῶς (haplos), and considered in the adjectival Doric form.

VII

SRN 1506 εἰλικρινής-eilikrines

Εἰλικρινής (Eilikrines), which is pronounced *i-lik-ree-nece'*, occurs only twice in the New Testament (Philippians 1:10, 2 Peter 3:1) and once in the Septuagint (Wisdom of Sol. 7:25). We will look first at Philippians 1:10, in the King James Version:

"That ye may approve things that are excellent; that ye may be sincere and without offense till the day of Christ."

In Jay P. Green's Interlinear translation we find a far superior translation to that of the King James Version, yet lacking in bringing forth the entire truth of this verse.

"For you to distinguish the things that differ, that you may be sincere and without blame for the day of Christ."

How does the King James Version get the word *excellent* out of the word *different*? How do they get the word *approve* out of the word *distinguish*? Are not the phrases *that ye may approve things that are excellent* and *for you to distinguish the things that differ* nearly opposite? In order to gain a fuller understanding of this verse, free of the deceptive wording of the King James Version, we shall have to translate the verse ourselves literally according to the Greek text. The verse reads in the AST:

"For you to test, examine, and distinguish between the differing, inferior man that you may be racially pure and void of offense for the Day of the Anointed."

The actual Greek of this verse reads: εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν ὑμᾶς τὰ διαφέροντα, ἵνα ἦτε εἰλικρινεῖς καί ἀπρόσκοποι εἰς ἡμέραν χριστοῦ (eis to dokimazein umas ta diapheronta, ina

ete eilikrineis kai aproskopoi eis emeran Christou.)

The words *test, examine, and distinguish between* are translated for the Greek word δοκιμάζειν (dokimazein). When we look at Liddell and Scott's definition of δοκιμάζειν (dokimazein), it becomes obvious why it is necessary to use this many English words to convey the entire concept. Liddell and Scott defines δοκιμάζειν (dokimazein) as: "to try, search, prove, test, to prove, to examine." The word *distinguish* is used in this translation based upon Jay P. Green's literal translation and other Greek lexicons.

The words *differing, inferior man* are translated for the Greek word διαφέροντα (diapheronta). Once again it is necessary to use a number of words to convey the concept expressed by the use of this Greek word. Διαφέροντα (diapheronta) is used thirteen times in the New Testament, and carries three different meanings, which are all dependent upon usage.

(1) It is used in Mark 11:16, Acts 13:49, and Acts 27:27, with a meaning of *carry out, disperse, and publish.*

(2) It is used in Galatians 2:6 and 4:1, and I Corinthians 15:41 with a meaning of *differing.*

(3) It is used in Matthew 6:26, 10:31, and 12:12, Luke 12:24, Romans 2:18, and here in Philippians 1:10 with a meaning of *differing,* and *superior/inferior.*

We find support for all of these usages in Liddell and Scott's definition: "[1] to bear through, carry over or across, carry from one to another, convey, [2] to differ, to be different from, [3] to be different from a man, to surpass, excel him, to prevail."

Finally, we come to the word under discussion in this chapter, εἰλικρινής (eilikrines). In this occurrence, one of only two in the New Testament, we find it to carry a strictly physical meaning. It has been translated *racially pure* based upon two points of criteria. First, that εἰλικρινής (eilikrines) is synonymous with ἀκέραιος (akeraios). This is irrefutably established in I Clement 2:5 where, in the common Alexandrian style, the two words are associated with the word καί (kai). The word ἀκέραιος (akeraios) is defined by Liddell

and Scott as: "unmixed, pure: pure in blood, incorrupt, unharmed, unravaged, inviolate, untouched." Bauer says: "pure, innocent, unmixed." Berry says: "unmixed." Thayer says: "unmixed, pure, without admixture." The Analytical Greek Lexicon says: "unmixed, without mixture." Strong says: "unmixed, innocent." But we curiously notice that none of these Judeo authorities go so far as to admit the undeniably racial connotations of the word.

Second, it is based upon Liddell and Scott's definition of εἰλικρινής (eilikrines), which reads: "examined by the sun's light, tested, found genuine, unmixed, distinct, separate, pure clean, uncorrupted, perfect, entire, distinct." Thus, we find ample proof for the word *pure*, and we are supported in saying *racially* by the context and by the word *unmixed* in the definition of εἰλικρινής (eilikrines).

The second New Testament usage of the word εἰλικρινής (eilikrines) in II Peter 3:1, reads in the King James Version:

> **"This second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you; in both which I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance."**

Here the word εἰλικρινής (eilikrines) is translated as *pure*. This may be a fairly adequate translation, but it does not convey the entire meaning. We do not have a physical usage as before, because of the use of the modifier διάνοιαν (dianoian) from νους (nous) or *mind*. However, the point the Apostle is conveying by the employment of εἰλικρινής (eilikrines) was, according to Christian writings, that only a *racially pure* Adamite could have a *pure mind*, and so the word is to be taken as both physical and mental. You cannot have a *pure mind* unless you have a *racially pure* body of the divine and chosen race, and so it is no less physical in this usage than in the previous, although it carries a slightly modified definition. We learn also from this that in the first usage of εἰλικρινής (eilikrines) we examined, although the context demands a physical translation, that not only was it a question of physical or racial purity, but it was also question of mental purity or

pure mindedness, as in this usage. So we come to understand that this word carries a physical and mental concept of *purity*.

This verse reads in the AST:

> **"Beloved, I now write this second letter to you, in which by reminder I stir up your pure minds to remember ..."**

The only other Biblical usage of this word is in the Septuagint in Wisdom 7:25, where the Wisdom of God is compared to a beautiful white Israelite woman, and which reads in Brenton's translation:

> **"For she is the breath of the power of God, and a pure influence flowing from the glory of the Almighty: therefore can no defiled thing fall into her."**

Here Brenton has tried to water down the passage by adding the word influence. The second part of the verse would more accurately read: **"and flowing from the glory of the Almighty is unmixed purity"**. We also find an interesting contrast between the word μεμιαμμένον (memiammenon) rendered as defiled in Brenton's translation and εἰλικρινής (eilikrines). This further supports the definition of *racially pure* assigned to εἰλικρινής (eilikrines), when we look at the definition of μεμιαμμένον (memiammenon), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "To paint over a white body with another color, hence to stain, dye, to stain, defile, soil, esp. blood, to taint, pollute, murder." This word had evolved into a term used in describing the act of an artist changing the color of a white person's body to a darker color, and in the vulgar or common street language of Koine Greek it was commonly used to describe the act or product of mongrelization. Many scholars credit the writing of Wisdom to Philo, an Alexandrian Israelite of the dispersion, who wrote in the same style and use of language as the Book of Wisdom. While we cannot go so far as to agree that Philo wrote Wisdom, we can agree that the book of Wisdom was indeed a product of the Alexandrian

Israelite writers, who wrote Wisdom at a time when the memory of Phineas and Esdras stilled burned vividly in their minds, and it is clear that the Israelites in dispersion, as represented by the Alexandrians, had long employed μεμιαμμένον (memiammenon) to describe the race-mixed and race-mixers. Since μεμιαμμένον (memiammenon) is contrasted to εἰλικρινής (eilikrines) then it is more than correct to say that they are the antithesis of each other. Since the opposite of εἰλικρινής (eilikrines) means to mongrelize, then εἰλικρινής (eilikrines) must logically carry the opposite meaning of *to not mongrelize* or *non-mongrelized*. This verse more accurately reads:

"For she is the breath of the power of God, and flowing from the glory of the Almighty is unmixed purity: therefore can no mongrelization creep into her."

We find further evidence for the racial implications of this verse simply by reading the following verse, Wisdom 7:26, which reads in Brenton's translation:

"For she is the brightness of the evelasting light, the unspotted mirror of the power of God, and the image of His goodness."

The word *unspotted* in this verse is translated for the Greek word ἀκηλίδωτον (akelidoton) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "priv. κηλιδόω [kelidoo] spotless, pure." As indicated in the definition, its opposite is κηλιδόω (kelidoo), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to stain, soil." It is derived from the word κηλίς (kelis), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a stain, spot, defilement, e.g. blood, etc., a blot, blemish, disgrace."

The blatant racial implications of Wisdom 7:25-26, when objectively analyzed in the full context of the Book of Wisdom in the Greek, taking into account the innumerable statements that carry undeniable explicit and implied racial overtones, as well as the moral and racial teachings of the

nation of Israel, become an indisputable fact when analyzed without prejudice or preconceived theological notions.

VIII

SRN 2513 καθαρός-katharos

Καθαρός (katharos), which is pronounced *kath-ar-os'*, occurs seventeen times in the King James Version of the New Testament as *pure*, ten times as *clean*, one time as *clear*, and approximately 153 times in the Septuagint, depending upon which manuscripts you rely upon. It is impossible to discuss all of the Septuagint usages in a work of this size; therefore, we will primarily focus upon the New Testament usages of καθαρός (katharos).

Before we look at any of the usages of καθαρός (katharos), it is necessary to first discuss its meaning, as it covers a very wide spectrum revolving around the concept of *pure*.

The word καθαρός (katharos) is defined by Liddell and Scott as "clean, pure, spotless, clear, open, free, cleanhanded, pure, clean, free from guilt or defilement, pure, unmixed, bright, clear, pure, unadulterated, without blemish in its kind, spotless, faultless, to be of pure blood." As is immediately obvious, this word can mean anything from *clear* to *unmixed* to *pure in blood*. It is used many times in the New Testament as *clean*, *clear*, and *faultless*. It is also used many times as *unadulterated*, *unmixed*, *pure*, *to be of pure blood*, or in contemporary language, *non-mongrelized*. This wide spectrum of meaning is very obvious when its Septuagint usages are also examined.

We find further light as to the meaning of καθαρός (katharos) when we compare it to its opposite, which is ἀκάθαρτος (akathartos). The word ἀκάθαρτος (akathartos) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "unclean, uncleaned, filthy in body, or mind, unpurified, unatoned, not fit for cleansing." Walter Bauer further defines the word as: "impure, unclean, impure things, impurities or vices." The word ἀκάθαρτος (akathartos) is a combination of the negative α (a) and καθαρός (katharos), thus being the opposite of καθαρός (katharos).

Κακός (kakos) is a synonym of ἀκάθαρτος (akathartos) which is defined Liddell and Scott as: "bad, evil, bad in its kind, bad by birth, bad, low, mean, vile." Therefore, καθαρός (katharos) illustrates, better than any other word we have dealt with, just how wide a criteria one word can cover. While καθαρός (katharos) primarily means *pure*, it is important to understand that its definition and meaning are often dependent upon *secundum usum*, that is, according to usage.

We find support for the meaning of *racially pure* or *nonmongrelized* in Herodotus 1:147, part of which reads in George Rawlison's translation:

> "The kings, too, whom they set over them, were either Lycians, of the blood of Glaucus, son of Hippolochus, or Pylian Causons of the blood of Codrus, son of Melanthus; or else from both those families. But since these Ionians set more store by the name than any of the others, let them pass for the pure-bred Ionians; though truly all are Ionians who have their origin from Athens, and keep the Apaturia."

Here καθαρός (katharos) is used in connection with γεγονότες (gegonotes), from γίνομαι (ginomai), a derivative of γένος (genos), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as "race." Therefore, Rawlison is well justified in translating καθαρός γεγονότες (katharos gegonotes) as pure bred, and he would have been just as correct in translating the phrase *pure race* or *unmixed race. Of what blood* or *race,* or the *family descent* of the kings whom they had set over them is discussed in this passage.

While it is true that καθαρός (katharos) itself is not translated by Rawlison as pure bred, it must be understood that the Greek is a very precise language, and the Greeks had dozens of words that all carried the meaning of *pure* in one aspect or another. The very fact that καθαρός (katharos) was used in conjunction with the words *blood* and *race* demonstrates that Herodotus used this word out of many words meaning *pure* because of its *racial* connotations, and in

the precise Greek language this was the word allotted to the concept of *race* and *blood*.

Humanist theologians argue that the Classical Greek somehow changed its meaning by New Testament times, the time of the usage of the common or Koine Greek, but the exact opposite is far closer to the truth. If anything, the Greek language progressed to become far richer, more fluent, and a great deal more precise. The Classical Greeks, as we have illustrated, were very racially conscious, yet they were discussing minute differences between Adamic or white people. Among the Classical Greeks, blond-headed and blue-eyed whites were considered a different racial stock from the brown-eyed, auburn-headed Celtic type Europeans.

By New Testament times, racial purity had become a more pronounced issue of importance. The world was no longer predominately white or Adamic. The race-mixing activities of the Phoenicians and the Accadians with Nubian slaves had resulted in an unnatural racial type proliferating throughout portions of the Middle East. As a consequence of the browning of the Middle East, the Greek language became richer in describing mongrelization, and many additional words, that at one time simply carried the concept of *pure*, began to carry even greater racial connotations. As the Hellens used the common or street language of Greek, the Hebraic Israelites also used common language. The entire theology of the ancient Hebrews had been built upon the idea of the racial purity of the chosen people. Thus, the New Testament writers carry this same racial theme forward, though it is expressed in Hellenistic idioms and blended with the language of Grecian philosophy.

Let us now look at the New Testament usages of καθαρός (katharos) in order. We first look at Matthew 5:8 which reads in the King James Version:

"Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God."

This is a fairly good and literal translation, differing from

the AST only slightly:

"Blessed are the pure in heart, because they will see God."

Here the word καθαροὶ (katharoi), the nominative plural masculine of καθαρός (katharos) is translated as *pure*, and we see it here used in a moral sense, because of the presence of the modifier καρδία (kardia) or heart. In Israelite theology, *heart* is often used as the seat of reasoning to designate the place of will, emotions, and thought. It was therefore a poetic way of describing what we today call the *mind*. To be *pure hearted* was to be pure in moral reasoning, which was verified by the belief system or explicit teachings of the New Testament writers. Therefore, if the New Testament explicitly teaches the necessity of racial purity, then to be of pure mind or heart and to be in agreement with Apostolic teachings is to be racially conscious.

We look next at Matthew 23:26, which reads in the King James:

"Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first that which is within the cup and platter, that the outside of them may be clean also."

We look now at a the AST:

"Blind Pharisee! Purify first the inside of the cup and of the dish, that the outside of them may also become pure."

Here καθαρός (katharos) is used twice in a physical sense, once in the verbal form *purify*, the 2nd person, singular, 1st aorist, imperative active, and also in the adjectival form *pure*. These two words are, however, modified by the presence of the metaphorical terms *cup* and *dish*, and so they are not translated racially purify, because they are used of inanimate objects, although the context implies racial purity.

We look next at Matthew 27:59, which reads in the King James:

"And when Joseph had taken the body, he wrapped it in a clean linen cloth..."

We look now at the AST:

"And taking the body, Joseph wrapped it in pure linen."

Again καθαρός (katharos) is used in a physical sense, and denotes an object that is free of foreign admixture. The linen cloth or bandages are 100% pure white linen bandages and are free of foreign materials. These bandages, or sindon-linen cloths, were specifically of the type used in Egyptian mummification procedures, the purest and cleanest available and specifically manufactured for the sacred burial procedure. The word *linen* is translated for the Greek word σινδόνι (sindoni), the dative singular of σινδών (sindon), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "sindon, a fine Indian cloth, muslin, esp. used for mummy-cloth, fine linen, surgeon's bandages." Sindon is defined by *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* as: "fine fabric, esp. of linen, a covering made of sindon."

We look next at Luke 11:41, which reads in the King James:

"But rather give alms of such things as ye have; and, behold, all things are clean unto you."

Let us look now at the AST:

"But give alms of the things which are within, and behold, all things are pure to you."

Here we have translated the word καθαρός (katharos) as *pure*. We have translated the word ἐλεημοσύνην (eleemosunen) as *pity*, which is defined by Liddell and Scott

as: "pity, mercy, alms – a corruption of the word."

We look next at John 13:10, which reads in the King James:

"Jesus saith to him, He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit: and ye are clean, but not all."

We look now at the AST:

"Jesus said to him, 'He having been bathed has no need except to wash the feet, but he is completely pure. And you are pure, but not all.'"

The word *bathed* is translated for the Greek word λελουμένος (leloumenos) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to wash, to wash the body, hands and feet, fresh-bathed, fresh and clean, to wash off or away." The word *wash* is translated for the Greek word νιψασθαι (nipsasthai) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to wash." The word *pure* is translated for our subject word καθαρός (katharos). In order to fully understand this verse you must also examine the next verse, John 13:11, which also contains καθαρός (katharos) and reads in the King James:

"For he knew who should betray him; therefore said he, Ye are not all clean."

Let us look now at the AST:

"For He knew the one betraying Him. For this reason He said, 'You are not all pure.'"

The word *pure* is again translated for our subject word καθαρός (katharos). Both of these last two verses may carry a strictly physical sense, as both are in reference to a physical person. Of course, the betrayer of Him, the one not pure, was Judas Iscariot. It is important to remember that Judas was a mongrel in mind, not *pure-hearted*, but it is not clear if he was

also a mongrel in body.

We look next at John 15:3, which reads in the King James:

"Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you."

We look now at the AST:

"You are already pruned because of the word which I have spoken to you."

In this instance, the word *pruned* has been chosen instead of *cleaned* or *purified*. When the passage is examined context, it is clear that *pruning* is what was implied and this concept is well-within the definition spectrum of the word.

We look next at Acts 18:6, which reads in the King James:

"And when they opposed themselves, and blasphemed, he shook his raiment, and said unto them, Your blood be upon your own heads; I am clean; from henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles."

We look now at the Anointed Standard Translation:

"But they, having resisted and blaspheming, shaking his garments, he said to them, 'Your blood be on your head. I am pure. From now on, I will go to the nations.'"

The word *resisted* is translated for the Greek word ἀντιτασσομένον (antitassomenon), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to range in battle against, drawn out, to oppose, resist." The word *pure* is translated for our subject word, καθαρός (katharos). The word *nations* is translated for the Greek word ἔθνη (ethne), the accusative plural of ἔθνος (ethnos). The context implies that the Apostle employed the word in reference to going to his racial type among the nations of the Adamics.

We look next at Acts 20:26, which reads in the King James

Version:

"Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men."

Let us look now at the superior translation of the AST:

"Therefore, I testify to you on this day that I am pure from the blood of all."

We look next at Romans 14:20, which reads in the King James Version:

"For meat destroy not the work of God. All things indeed are pure, but it is evil for that man who eateth with offence."

From the AST:

"Do not undo the action of God because of food. All things truly are pure, but bad to the man who eats through a stone of stumbling-block."

Here the word καθαρός (katharos) is used of food, a physical object.

We look next at I Timothy 1:5, which reads in the King James:

"Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned."

We look now at the AST:

"But the end of the commandment is honorable brotherly love, out of a racially pure heart, and a good conscience and unpretended persuasion."

The words *brotherly love* are translated for the Greek word ἀγάπη (agape) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "love, brotherly love." The words *racially pure* are translated for our subject word καθαρός (katharos). Here the word is used in a physical sense, and the *heart* is that *heart belonging to one racially pure.*

We look next at I Timothy 3:9, which reads in the King James Version:

"Holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience."

Let us look now at the AST:

"Holding the mystery of the persuasion with a racially pure conscience."

The words *racially pure* are translated for our subject word καθαρός (katharos). This occurrence, like the last, is used in a physical sense, and the *conscience* is that characteristic *belonging to one racially pure.* The obvious assumption of this verse is that only a person who is racially pure can have this conscience.

We look next at II Timothy 1:3, which reads in the King James:

"I thank God, whom I serve from my forefathers with pure conscience, that without ceasing I have remembrance of thee in my prayers night and day."

Now, let us look at the AST:

"Thanks I have to God, Whom I worship from my racial ancestors in a racially pure conscience, how unceasingly I have remembrance concerning you in my petitions night and day."

The words *racial ancestors* are translated for the Greek word

προγόνων (progonon), which is a combination of the word πρό (pro) meaning *before* and γονος (gonos), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "race, birth, descent, seed." The two words combined mean *racial ancestors*. Liddell-Scott-Jones includes the definition: "also of gods or heroes who are the *authors* or *founders* of a race." The words racially pure are translated for our subject word καθαρός (katharos).

We look next at II Timothy 2:22, which reads in the King James Version:

"Flee also youthful lusts: but follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace, with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart."

Let us look now at the more accurate translation of the AST:

"Also, flee youthful lusts, and pursue justice, persuasion, honorably brotherly love, peace, with those calling on the Master out of a racially pure heart."

Here once again, our subject word καθαρός (katharos) is translated *racially pure*, and is used in the sense that such a heart can only belong to someone who is racially pure.

We look next at Titus 1:15, which reads in the King James:

"Unto the pure all things are pure: but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure, but even their mind and conscience is defiled."

The AST says:

"In every way in fact are the nonmongrelized, nonmongrelized, but to the ones having been mongrelized and having no persuasion, nothing is nonmongrelized, but even their mind and conscience has been mongrelized."

All three occurrences of the word *nonmongrelized* in this verse are translated for our subject word καθαρός (katharos). Both of the occurrences of the word *mongrelized* in this verse are translated for μεμίανται (memiantai), from μιαίνω (miaino), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "strictly to paint over a white body with another color, hence to stain, dye, to stain, defile, soil, esp. [especially] with blood, to taint, defile, pollute, murder." A synonym of μιαίνω (miaino) is μίασμα (miasma), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a dyeing, stain, defilement." Both of these words and μιασμός (miasmos), discussed elsewhere, are synonymous and share the same definition. All three words were later used to describe the act of an artist painting over a white body, and all three were commonly used to described mongrelization.

We look next at Hebrews 10:22, which reads in the King James:

"Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water."

Let us look now at the more accurate translation of the Anointed Standard Translation:

"Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of persuasion, our hearts having been sprinkled from an evil conscience, and the body having been washed in pure water."

Here we see the King James Version is fairly accurate. Our subject word, καθαρός (katharos), is in reference to water, a physical object, and is racial only by implication.

We look next at Jacob (James) 1:27, which reads in the King James Version:

"Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the

world."

From the AST:

"Religion purified and of the unmongrelized before God and the Father is this: to visit the orphans and widows in their affliction, keeping himself unspotted from the world."

The word *unmongrelized* is translated for ἀμίαντος (amiantos). For an explanation of this word see SRN 283 ἀμίαντος-amiantos.[19] The word *purified* is translated for our subject word, καθαρός (katharos). The word *unspotted* is translated for the Greek word ἄσπιλον (aspilon), defined by Liddell and Scott as: "without stain, spotless, pure." Here it must suffice to say that ἄσπιλον (aspilon) is used in a metaphorical sense denoting sexual activity as well as racial purity. This word is also used I Peter 1:19 and II Peter 3:14. The opposite of ἄσπιλον (aspilon) is σπίλος (spilos), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a spot, stain, blemish, Att. [Attic Form:] κηλίς [kelis]." As Liddell and Scott state, the Attic form of this word is κηλίς (kelis), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a stain, spot, defilement, e.g. blood, etc., a blot, blemish, disgrace." It is clear that the Christians used the term ἄσπιλον (aspilon) in reference to *racial purity*, as Sophocles used its opposite in reference to *racial impurity*. In the street language of Hellenstic Palestine it came to connote keeping oneself *untainted, unmongrelized*, whether mentally or physically, therefore emphasizing our subject word to carry an even more pronounced racial connotation.

Let us look next at I Peter 1:22, which reads in the King James Version:

"Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the

---

[19] See Chapter XII.

brethren, see that ye loved one another with a pure heart fervently."

The AST:

"Purifying your lives in the obedience of the truth, to unpretended honorable brotherly love, love one another fervently out of a [racially pure] heart."

Once again, our subject word, καθαρός (katharos), is used of a heart that can only belong to the racially pure as an attribute or a characteristic. However, it should be noted that the words *racially pure* are enclosed in open brackets in the Anointed Standard Translation. This means that there is an equal amount of textual evidence supporting the inclusion of the word καθαρός (katharos) as there is supporting the omission of the word. For this reason, it has been kept in the translation but marked with the open brackets.

It should be noted also that the words διὰ πνεύματος (dia pneumatos), which are translated *through the Spirit* in the King James Version, are absent from the Anointed Standard Translation. These words do not appear to enter into any Greek texts until the 8th century AD, and have been omitted for this reason.

Let us look next at Revelations 15:6, which reads in the King James Version:

"And the seven angels came out of the temple, having the seven plagues in pure and white linen, and having their breasts girded with golden girdles."

Let us now look at the AST:

"And the seven messengers having the seven plagues came forth out of the temple, having been clothed in pure and bright linen, and golden bands having been girded around their breasts."

Our subject word, καθαρός (katharos), is herein translated *pure*. The word linen is translated for the Greek word λίνον (linon), and we notice that the word *linen* in this verse is not translated for the same Greek word as was the word *linen* in the King James Version in Matthew 27:59. There the Greek word was σινδών (sindon).

Let us look now at Revelations 19:8 which reads in the King James Version:

"And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white: for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints."

We look now at the AST:

"And it was given to her that she be clothed in fine linen, pure and bright; for the fine linen is the justice of the Separated Ones."

Herein καθαρός (katharos) is translated pure. Here we find more insight as to the meaning of the *linen* in its metaphorical application. When καθαρός (katharos) is used in conjunction with the white linen, the phrase connotes a metaphorical statement of white racial purity, and was indicative of the reward of the just.

We look next at Revelations 19:14, which reads in the King James Version:

"And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean."

The Anointed Standard Translation:

"And the armies in Heaven followed Him on white horses, being dressed in fine linen, white and pure."

Here our subject word καθαρός (katharos) is translated

pure, and is in reference to a physical object. It is interesting to note from this that John's conception of pure was something white. Even today, if you asked people to look at something that was black or brown, and asked them if it was pure, their response more than likely would be *no;* although, if asked the same about something white, their response would more than likely be *yes*. To most people, the color white carries with it the concept of *cleanliness* or *purity*. When we couple this with a true understanding of our subject word, we begin to comprehend the metaphorical language of the Apocalypse.

We look next at Revelations 21:18, which reads in the King James Version:

"And the building of the wall of it was of jasper: and the city was pure gold, like unto clear glass."

We look now at the AST:

"And the structure of its wall, jasper; and the city, pure gold, like pure glass."

Here our subject word καθαρός (katharos) occurs twice, and both times we have translated it *pure*. Both are physical, although neither are racial as they are in reference to inanimate objects.

We look next at Revelations 22:1, which reads in the King James Version:

"And he shewed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the New Lamb."

Let us look now at the more accurate translation of the Anointed Standard Translation:

"And he showed me a pure river of water of life, bright as crystal, coming forth out of the throne of God and of the Lamb."

Except for the fact that the King James Version translators added in the word *new* before *lamb* and translated *bright* as *clear*, their translation is in this case fairly accurate. Our subject word καθαρός (katharos) is translated *pure* and is in reference to a *river of water*. It is important to remember that the language of Revelation was, in its origin, written in highly metaphorical terms, and that such symbolic language and imagery must be understood and interpreted in light of the clear and explicit teachings of the Apostolic writers.

IX

SRN 1505 εἰλικρινείᾳ-eilikrineia

The word εἰλικρινείᾳ (eilikrineia), which is pronounced *i-lik-ree´-niah*, occurs three times in the New Testament (I Cor. 5:8; II Cor. 1:12, 2:17), and does not occur in the Septuagint. We look first at I Corinthians 5:8, which reads in the King James Version:

"Therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."

Let us look now at a more accurate and literal translation of this passage in the Anointed Standard Translation:

"So let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, not with leaven of low birth and of evil but with unleavened of racial purity and truth according to nature."

The words *low birth* are translated for the Greek word κακίας (kakias), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as "bad, ill, evil, bad in its kind, of low birth, mean, vile." The words *racial purity* are translated for our subject word εἰλικρινείᾳ (eilikrineia), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "clearness, pureness, genuiness." For a full definition we must see its derivative εἰλικρινής (eilikrines), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "examined by the sun's light, tested, found genuine, unmixed, distinct, separate, pure clean, uncorrupted, perfect, entire, distinct." In the definition given by Liddell and Scott for εἰλικρινείᾳ (eilikrineia) we find there the concept of *clearness*.

Clearness. In many of the definitions given for our subject synonyms and in translations of the King James Version, the concept of *clearness* or *clear* is expressed or translated. The reason for this is because the concept of *clear* was thought of in

this way: If something is *pure*, such as water, then it is *clear*. While the application to water or air are some of the few one may be able to think of, it was enough, in archaic Middle English, to justify the thinking of associating *clear* and *pure* as synonymous terms. *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* defines one of the older usages of the word *clear* in this way: "without admixture of other color, pure." They also say in their definition: "unspotted, pure, unsullied, undarkened, bright." As we see in this definition, the word clear also carried the connotation of *undarkened, bright*. This evolved from the word being used of celestial masses, as one might say the clear stars, it was not that they were translucent, but they were simply *undarkened* and *bright*. The word *clear* carries a much narrower definition today than at the time of the translation of the King James Version, as well as at the time of the compiling of our lexicons. At that time, the word did carry the connotation of *pure*, as we have said, in the sense of something *uncolored, unpolluted*.

Now looking back at our verse. The words *truth according to nature* in this verse are translated for the Greek word ἀληθείας (aletheias), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "truth, reality, according to truth and nature, sincerity, candour."

The next usage of εἰλικρινείᾳ (eilikrineia) occurs in II Corinthians 1:12, which reads in the King James Version:

"For our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world, and more abundantly to you-ward."

We look now at the AST:

"For our boasting is this, the testimony of our conscience, that we behaved in the world in separation and godly racial purity, not in fleshly wisdom, but in the favor of God, and more abundantly toward you."

In this verse our subject word, εἰλικρινείᾳ (eilikrineia), is translated *racial purity*, or what is translated as *sincerity* in the King James Version. The word *simplicity* in the King James Version is translated for the word ἁπλότητι (haploteti), which also means *racial purity*. However, the original reading of the Greek is ἁγιοτητι (hagioteti), which means and is translated *separation*. Whether this mistake in the Textus Receptus was accidental or not, it has served to make the passage redundant and cause question as to the meaning both of our subject word εἰλικρινείᾳ (eilikrineia) and of ἁπλότητι (haploteti), the subject word of Chapter 5.

The next and last Biblical usage of εἰλικρινείᾳ (eilikrineia) occurs in II Corinthians 2:17, which reads in the King James Version:

"For we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God: but as sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ."

Let us look now at the AST:

"For we are not as many, who adulterate the Word of God, but as of racial purity, but as of God, we speak in the Anointed in the sight of God."

The word *adulterate* is translated for the Greek word καπηλεύω (kapeleuo) which is defined by Joseph Thayer as: "to adulterate." Liddell and Scott: "to adulterate." Trench states that the words δολόω (doloo) and καπηλεύω (kapeleuo) are synonymous, and the word δολόω (doloo) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to beguile, ensnare, take by craft, to make deceitful, counterfeit, adulterate, to stain, dye." So we find the word *adulterate* in the definitions of both of these words. The words *racial purity* are translated for our subject word εἰλικρινείᾳ (eilikrineia). It should be noted that some texts read *For we are not as the rest, instead of as the many,* and although some very early texts contain this alternate

reading, the preponderance of evidence indicates that it was not original.

X

SRN 1103 γνήσιος-gnesios

Γνήσιος (Gnesios), which is pronounced gne´-see-os, occurs four times in the New Testament (I Tim. 1:2, Tit. 1:4, Philippians 4:3, II Cor. 8:8) and twice in the Septuagint (Sir. 7:18, III Ma. 3:19). We look first at I Timothy 1:2, which reads in the King James Version:

"Unto Timothy, my own son in the faith: Grace, mercy, and peace, from God the Father and Jesus Christ our Lord."

Let us look now at the AST:

"To Timothy, a racially pure child in the persuasion, Favor, mercy, and peace, from God the Father and Jesus Anointed our Master."

The words *racially pure* are translated for our subject word γνήσιος (gnesios), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "Belonging to the true race, legitimate, opp. [opposed to] νόθος [nothos], genuine, true, lawful, true, to have a noble mind." As stated in Liddell and Scott's definition, this word's opposite is νόθος (nothos) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a bastard, base born, any child born of a foreign woman, spurious, counterfeit, adulterated." Νόθος (nothos) is the product or end result of νοθεύω (notheuo), which is defined by Lampe as: "corrupt, seduce, adulterate." Lampe also adds the words "cross bred" to the definition of νόθος (nothos). Can there be any doubt as to the meaning of this word? The words *cross bred* are defined by *Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary* as: "produced by the union of different varieties, breeds, or races, mongrel." *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* adds: "produced by interbreeding two pure but different breeds." By using the term *cross-bred*

Lampe makes very clear the meaning of this word. For emphatic evidence proving that νόθος (nothos) means mongrel, see Chapter 13.

Genuine, Bastard. It is important to understand the meanings of the words *genuine* and *bastard* as used at the time of the publishing of Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon. We have discussed the word *adulterate* and its racial implications in the year 1846 elsewhere in this book[20], here it is sufficient to say that at that time it did indeed carry a meaning of *mixing, impurifying,* and generally denoted *race-mixing.* We have also discussed at length the meaning of the word *bastard* in Chapter 13, and it should suffice to say here that up until this century, the word was almost exclusively used for *a mongrel.* The word *genuine* is defined by *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* as: "not foreign, natural, not adulterated or cheapened, pure." Now the point here is that the word *genuine* is the opposite of *spurious* or *bastard,* and when used in the definition, it carries racial implications. But nothing more needs to be said other than the fact that the opposite of γνήσιος (gnesios) is νόθος (nothos) and we have irrefutably proven in Chapter 13 that the word νόθος (nothos) means *a mongrel.* Our subject word must be the opposite of this.

Does any reasonable man or woman need any more proof than this that this word γνήσιος (gnesios) does indeed mean *racially pure*? We have the clear and precise definition of *belonging to the true race, legitimate, genuine,* and its opposite's definition of *a mongrel.*

Here is the clearest evidence for the unprejudiced mind for proof of the racial consciousness of the New Testament. It also provides evidence for the dishonest activities of pseudo-scholars, who repeatedly choose to veil and conceal the most blatant and obvious truths of God's Word. This they have done through romantic euphemisms designed to sell an unsuspecting and ignorant public a Humanist philosophy that

---

[20] See pg. 138.

blatantly misrepresents Primitive Christianity. We can only conclude such gross deception to be the activity of the antichrists. The words of the Hebrew prophet Hosea could not be truer or more pertinent if they had been written today:

> **"Imprecation and lying and murder and stealing and adultery are poured out upon the land, and they mix blood with blood. ... My people have become like one who lacks knowledge; because you have rejected knowledge, I also will reject you from being a priest to me. And you forgot the law of your God; I also will forget your children."**[21]

Γνήσιος (Gnesios) is associated with εὐγενοῦς (eugenous) in Philo's *The Embassy to Gaius* 195, which reads:

> "If then both causes which we were sent to plead were lost, someone perhaps will say, 'Well what then? did they not know how to manage their safe return?' To such a one I would say, 'Either you have not the racially pure [γνήσιος (gnesios)] affection of a man good in race [εὐγενοῦς (eugenous)], or you were not reared or trained in the sacred writings.' The truly good in race [εὐγενοῦς (eugenous)] are always hopeful and the laws create good hopes for those who take more than a mere sip of their study."

Philo herein states that this affection is an attribute of *racial purity* that can only belong to a man *good in race*. Thus, γνήσιος (gnesios) and εὐγενοῦς (eugenous) are synonymous terms. Εὐγενοῦς (Eugenous) is a combination of εὐ (eu) meaning "good, well," and γένος (genos) meaning "race," and the two words combined mean *good in race*.

The next usage of γνήσιος (gnesios) occurs in Titus 1:4 which reads in the King James Version:

---

[21] ΩΣΗΕ (Hosëe-Hosea) 4:2, 6 NETS.

"To Titus mine own son after the common faith: Grace, mercy, and peace, from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ our Savior."

Let us look now at the AST:

"To Titus, a racially pure child according to the common persuasion, favor and peace, from God the Father and the Master Jesus the Anointed, our Savior."

We have here a very similar verse to our previous usage of our subject word in I Timothy 1:2, and once again we have translated our subject word γνήσιος (gnesios) as *racially pure*. We note that the King James Version, following the Textus Receptus, adds the word *mercy* translated for ἔλεος (eleos), or what would correctly be translated *compassion*. However, the oldest manuscripts omit the word. *Favor* and *peace* is the typical Pauline salutation, as shown in I Timothy 1:2 and II Timothy 1:2, and for this reason and the textual support it can be concluded that the word was added near the 5th century.

We look now at Philippians 4:3, which reads in the King James Version:

"And I entreat thee also, true yokefellow, help those women which laboured with me in the gospel, with Clement also, and with others my fellow labourers whose names are in the book of life."

Let us look now at the Anointed Standard Translation:

"And I also ask you, racially pure yokefellow, assist them, who in the good message struggle with me, and with Clement, and the rest, fellow-workers with me, whose names are in the Book of Life."

Let us first address the most notable difference. In our

translation the word *women* is absent. We have scrutinized every major text of the Greek New Testament, among them the Textus Receptus, the Diaglot, the Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, and others, and various Interlinears, including Jay P. Green's and Rick Berry's, and all of the above sources do not have a Greek word for women. In fact, the word *women* does not appear in any Greek text, including the one that the Second Westminster Company, headed by William Barlow, used to translate this verse for the King James Version. This word was not even put in italics by the aforementioned translators. Here, the KJV translators have taken the reflexive pronoun in the feminine gender for *them* and supplied the word "women." This is not as strong a case as Jacob 4:3-4[22] for supplying the feminine gender in an English translation, however, as some have argued. The reflexive pronoun αὐταῖς (*them*) is used in about twenty other occurrences in the New Testament, and is used sometimes of *men*, *women*, *both*, or even of other nouns, such as *sacrifices*. Only in this instance did the KJV feel it necessary to supply the noun *women*. Because of this, supplying a feminine gender, and certainly the introduction of the noun *women*, in the English translation of αὐταῖς is not comparable to Jacob 4:3-4, as some have claimed. This is but one of hundreds of examples of the incredible arrogance and willful deceptive efforts by the translators of the "Queen James" Version. There are over a thousand blatant and obvious errors in the King James Version, and an estimated additional twenty thousand syntax problems, whether deliberate or accidental.

With this in mind, we look first at the words *racially pure*. They are translated for our subject word, γνήσιος (gnesios). The word *yokefellow* is translated for the Greek word σύζυγε (suzuge), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a yokefellow, comrade, friend."

The last New Testament usage of γνήσιος (gnesios) is in II Corinthians 8:8, which reads:

---

[22] See pp. 172-173 for a more detailed discussion of Jacob 4:3-4 (AST).

"I speak not by commandment, but by occasion of the forwardness of others, and to prove the sincerity of your love."

Let us look now at the Anointed Standard Translation:

"I do not speak according to command but through the earnestness of others, and to show as good the racial purity of honorable brotherly love."

The word *earnestness* is translated for the Greek word σπουδῆς (spoudes) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "haste, zeal, pains, earnestness, zeal." The words *show as good* are translated for the Greek word δοκιμάζων (dokimazon) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to prove, test, to approve, sanction, to hold as good, pure." The words *racial purity* are translated for our subject word γνήσιος (gnesios).

The first Septuagint usage we will look at is in Wisdom of the Son of Sirach, or otherwise known as Ecclesiasticus 7:18, which reads in Brenton's translation:

"Change not a friend for any good by no means; neither a faithful brother for the gold of Suphir."

We look now at a more accurate and literal translation of this verse:

"Exchange not a beloved friend by no means, neither a racially pure brother for the gold of Supheir."

The word *exchange* is translated for the Greek word ἀλλάξης (allaxes) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to make otherwise, to take in exchange, exchange one." *Beloved friend* is translated for the Greek word Φίλον (philon) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "loved, beloved, dear, a friend." This word was also used as a common name, especially among the Alexandrian Israelites, under the form Φίλων (Philon). *Racially pure* is translated for our subject word

γνήσιος (gnesios).

The last Septuagintal usage and the last Biblical usage of this word is in III Maccabees 3:19, which reads in Brenton's translation:

> **"And thus, exhibiting their enmity against us, they alone among the nations lift up their heads against kings and benefactors, as men unwilling to submit to anything reasonable."**

Let us look now at a more accurate translation of this verse:

> **"And thus, manifesting their hostile enmity against us, they alone among the nations lift up their heads against kings and well-doers, as men not wishing to produce racially pure."**

The word *manifesting* is translated for the Greek word ἐκδηλον (ekdelon) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "very manifest." The words *hostile enmity* are translated for the Greek word δυσμένειαν (dusmeneian) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "enmity, hostile." The word *well-doers* is translated for the Greek word εὐεργέταις (euergetais), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a well-doer." The word *wishing* is translated for the Greek word βούλονται (boulontai), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to, will, wish, be willing." The word *produce* is translated for the Greek word Φέρειν (pherein) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to bear, bring forth, produce, be fruitful, to bring in, yield, produce." The words *racially pure* are translated for our subject word γνήσιος (gnesios). In this verse we find the word γνήσιος (gnesios) used as a noun, describing the end result of the verb, *produce*. It can only be taken physically in this verse, because of the modifier *produce*. In Brenton's translation, as usual, he has invented a fictional definition of the word γνήσιος (gnesios), namely, *anything reasonable*, a definition that cannot be found in even the most corrupt lexicons. As we have

seen, it is Brenton's style to either drop a word with racial implications out of his work, or make up a fictional definition. At the same time, he is forced to make up a definition for other words in the verse. The end result is a translation so corrupt that it completely veils, hides, and twists the true intentions of the actual Greek authors, and it must be classified as bad fiction. Yet, in the original Greek of the Septuagint we have the legacy and heritage of our Adamic ancestors passing to us the necessity of the wisdom of racial consciousness, bequeathing to us the very words of the Living God, affirming for us the immutable law of God in nature, in the clearest and most explicit language. Yet, the modern western world has rejected its Septuagint heritage and its holy bequest of the true Israelites of God, and have in its place adopted the Judaizing myths of the Masoretic Text. In this action, they have exalted the Talmudist to an unwarranted position of authority. At this hour, in the hearts and minds of far too many Adamic men, the Talmudic Zionists have, through deception and false scholarship, propped themselves up as authority figures above Jesus Christ and His Church.

XI

SRN 1104 γνησίως-gnesios

Γνησίως (gnesios), which is pronounced gnee-see´-oce, occurs once in the New Testament (Philippians 2:20) and twice in the Septuagint (II Ma. 14:8, III Ma. 3:23). We look first at its only New Testament occurrence, Philippians 2:20, which reads in the King James Version:

"For I have no man likeminded, who will naturally care for your state."

Let us look now at the Anointed Standard Translation:

"For I have no one of equal mind, who in racial consciousness will care for the things about you."

The words *in racial consciousness* are translated for our subject word γνησίως (gnesios), which is an adverb form of SRN 1103 γνήσιος (gnesios) which we dealt with previously. It is obvious that the only difference between these two words is that SRN 1104 has a long ω (omega), and that SRN 1103, the root word, has a short o (omicron). In many cases, words that are different in this nature are treated as one word; however, these two words have most often in the past been treated as two different words. It is for this reason that we have chosen to treat the two words separately. Let us keep in mind that even though they have been treated separately, they share the same identical definition, that of the root γνήσιος (gnesios). Liddell and Scott do not give a definition for our subject word, stating only that it is an adverb form of γνήσιος (gnesios). Thus, for the definition of this word we must see the definition of γνήσιος (gnesios), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "Belonging to the true race, legitimate, opp. [opposed to] νόθος [nothos], genuine, true, lawful, true, to have a noble

mind." As stated in Liddell and Scott's definition, this word's opposite is νόθος (nothos) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a bastard, base born, any child born of a foreign woman, spurious, counterfeit, adulterated." A related word to γνησιως (gnesios) and γνήσιος (gnesios) is γενναῖος (gennaios), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "suitable to one's birth or descent, high blood, esp. [especially] noble, good of their kind." For a more complete explanation and discussion of this definition see SRN 1103-γνήσιος (gnesios).[23]

An adverb, of course, is a word that modifies a verb, an adjective, or another adverb. It answers the questions *where, when, how, how often, to what extent*. Since it is answering one of these questions and since it is answering to the question of likemindedness, we have used the word consciousness in the translation, which is also supported by the definition, which shows that a mental application is possible. An alternate translation would simply be *in racial purity*. In the prepositional phrase *in racial consciousness,* the word *racial* acts as an adjective and modifies *consciousness; in racial consciousness* is a prepositional phrase used adverbially to describe *how* someone *will care*. It must be remembered that we are dealing with the Greek language. In Greek, this concept is expressed by a single word instead of a prepositional phrase. The word γνησίως (gnesios) is an adverb that modified the word μεριμνήσει (merimnesei) or *will care*, a verb. This is therefore a literal translation, although an English phrase must be used to translate a single Greek word in order to conform to the differences in grammatical structure. In order to do this, we must construct a phrase instead of a single word.

For example, the King James Version has an average of five grammatical errors per verse, and the same may be said for most other translations. In our translation we have tried to stay *secundum syntaxes*, that is, *according to syntax;* while at the same time endeavoring to make it conform to our American English grammatical rules.

---

[23] See also Chapter X, SRN 1103 γνησιος-gnesios.

Using a prepositional phrase to express an adverb, which is what we have done here, is correct English. We were forced to do this because a single English adverb does not, in most cases, express a Greek word entirely. In a translation such as the AST, for every Greek word used there is an average of 1.7 English words used to express the concept, so precise grammatical transference is nearly impossible. Yet, as we have illustrated, it is more than possible to convey the real thought expressed into Modern English.

Noble. The word *noble* is mentioned in Liddell and Scott's definition of this word, as well as in the definition of some other synonyms dealt with in this book. The word *noble* has its origin from the Latin word *nosco*, which evolved into the Latin word *nobilis*, and both of these Latin words simply meant *known*.

The term became used of a person's birth. If a person had a *known* birth, or *noble* birth, that meant the person's genealogy and breeding were known. This always indicated high breeding or a good genealogy. Having a good genealogy denoted being of pure stock, and so to be of a *noble* family meant to be of a family whose *genealogy was known*. Since the term was a positive term then it always denoted a good genealogy. Much the same may be said of the term Israelite among the dispersed Israelites of the first century. When Christ speaks of Nathanael in the KJV, **"Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile,"** it is clear in the Greek that he uses the term Israelite in reference to Nathanael's noble racial descent; for what Christ actually said was: **"Behold, truly an Israelite in whom is no adulteration"** (John 1:47 AST). Here *Israelite* takes on a meaning of *known birth* or *good genealogy*, when Jesus declares Nathanael to be a pure Israelite without *trickery* or *deceit* or *unknown origin*, in using the Greek word δόλος (dolos) (See Chapter III SRN 97 ἄδολος-adolos). This is in direct contrast to the presence in Judea of the Edomites, who were deceitfully claiming a birthright and noble genealogy that was not theirs.

This was indeed a very high compliment paid to Nathanael by our Savior. Why our Lord spoke to Nathanael in

this way is still a matter of conjecture. Perhaps Nathanael shared the morphological characteristics of King David, who as we are told, was "blond and red-haired."[24] Or perhaps, as the text indicates, Christ was simply paying Nathanael a salutatory racial complement, as is common among racial brothers even today. Be this as it may, what is important is the fact that Christ's usage of the word *Israelite* makes it synonymous with the concept of *noble*. These simple truths used to be taught in every town and village.

Not so many years ago, our nation was dotted with little school houses and filled with eager students and dedicated teachers who taught the basic skills of the liberal arts, which are necessary for the maintenance of freedom and Adamic culture. Our children were taught a classical curriculum that introduced them to the literature and culture of their ancestors.

The Adamic Christian standards were high, and those of our grandparents who did receive a high school education were far better educated than our modern college graduates, for their education was classically and culturally centered around Adamic Christian standards. One may complain about the lowering of educational standards in order to accommodate other races and cultures, and while there is some truth in this complaint, the real truth is we have not *lowered* education, we have *abandoned* education. It is not a case of simply lowering standards, it is rather a case of failing to educate *fully* because our so-called educational system has forsaken *truth*. No white man can be truly educated if he is not educated to his racial heritage.

Our grandparents were introduced, at least in general, to basic Latin and even some Greek, because it was necessary in order for them to appreciate the great heritage and the rich history of the Adamic man. For hundreds of years, the Humanists and the Talmudic Zionists have worked diligently to veil and conceal the plain truths of classical writers as well

---

[24] See Archibald Henry Sayce's Races of the Old Testament, pg. 115, and I Samuel 17:42.

as the Bible, all in an orchestrated attempt to rob and to steal away the rightful heritage of the Adamic people.

We do not have an educational system in this country. We have a Humanist conspiracy in motion designed to de-educate and produce silly and stupid children who have no knowledge of their cultural heritage, no discipline and no morality, little conception of honor, and who are barely skilled enough to work at a fast-food restaurant.

As Christ contended with the Pharisees and Edomites, we are today contending with the Talmudists and Zionists, who have plotted to cheat the Adamic Christian family out of their rightful heritage; to this end, they have sought to conceal and revile the classical heritage of the Adamic Christian. They do not want them to be disciplined in the arts of language, or in touch with the true history of their past, for then they would be able to think and they would soon realize that the manifest Satans of this world intend to enslave and kill them. When the prophet spoke of lack of knowledge, he spoke of all true science or true knowledge, as Paul confirms. It is just as important for our people to be able to read Philo and Josephus as it is to read the Apostle Paul.

Today, colleges and seminaries are filled with educated idiots who are taught to ignore and conceal truth in the name of Humanism, the largest denominational religion in America. Adamic Christian culture, values, and freedom will not be restored through the work of a few pamphleteers. It will come about only as you educate yourself and others, not only to the truth of God's Word, but to the true heritage of the Israel of God and Jesus Christ our Lord. The true enemy of the Adamic race is ignorance. Christ has said, **"If you continue in My Word, you are truly My students. And you will know the truth, and truth will set you free"** (John 8: 32 AST).

He who will educate others must first be educated himself. We must win the minds and hearts of our fellow Adamic men before there can be any restoration of Christian law and order. The real fight is for the minds and hearts of the Adamic people. There is but one rallying point, one platform upon which Adamic men can rally and stand if the race is to be

saved and overcome its deadly enemies. That standard is solely the New Covenant of Jesus Christ. Selfish asceticism, escapism, and the perpetuation of Talmudic-inspired racist and romantic philosophies will not unite the Adamic race to action.

Only the true Word of God in its original autographs offers any hope for an insane world bent on destruction and death. The Living God does not ask the impossible of His people, for He asks them only to believe His Word.

> **"And how may they be persuaded to One of Whom they have not heard? And how may they hear without preaching? And how may they preach if they are not sent? ... Then persuasion is of hearing, and hearing through the Word of the Anointed"** (Romans 10:14-15, 17 AST).

Faith, or persuasion, comes by hearing, and true hearing only by the Word of the Everliving God. How shall they hear, without a preacher-teacher, and how shall they preach or teach except they first be educated and sent? Study to show yourself approved unto God. Do not study to show yourself approved by men, but study to the approval of the standard of the Living Word of God.

Returning now to our subject word, let us look at the first Septuagint usage of γνησίως (gnesios), which occurs in II Maccabees 14:8, which reads in Brenton's translation:

> **"First, verily for the unfeigned care I have of things pertaining to the king; and secondly, even for that I intend the good of my own citizens: for all our nation is in no small misery through the unadvised dealing of them aforesaid."**

We look now at a more accurate and literal translation of this verse:

> **"First, because I am concerned in racial purity for the**

king's interests, and secondly out of regard for my fellow-citizens, for through the inconsiderate behavior of those whom I have mentioned, our whole race is in no small misfortune."

The words *racial purity* are translated for our subject word γνησίως (gnesios), and once again we have formed a prepositional phrase used adverbially. We note here also that the translation *racial consciousness* could also be used. The word *race* is translated for the Greek word γένος (genos) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "race, stock, descent, esp. [especially] noble, to be of divine descent."

We look now at the last Septuagint usage and the last Biblical usage of γνησίως (gnesios), which occurs in III Maccabees 3:23, and reads in Brenton's translation:

"...have rejected the inestimable rights. Not only so, but by using speech, and by refraining from speech, they abhor the few among them who are heartily disposed towards us; ever deeming that their ignoble course of procedure will force us to do away with our reform."

Let us look now at a more accurate translation:

"...having turned away from the unhonored commonwealth. Not only this, by using words, and silence, they disgust the few sitting among them who are in racial purity disposed towards us; ever deeming that their ignoble course of procedure will force us to do away with our reform."

The word *unhonored* is translated for the Greek word ἀτίμητον (atimeton) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "unhonored, without the honor of." The word *commonwealth* is translated for the Greek word πολιτείαν (politeian) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "the life of a citizen, civil policy, the condition of a state, a commonwealth, the republic." It is from this word that we get the English word

politics. The word *disgust* is translated for the Greek word βδελύσσονται (bdelussontai) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "abominable, to detest, disgusting, to cause to stink." The words *racial purity* are translated for our subject word γνησίως (gnesios), and again we see that it could have be translated as *racial consciousness*.

In conclusion, this word carries one meaning, but can be used in two ways: *racial purity* or *racial consciousness*. It is always translated in English as a prepositional phrase acting as an adverb.

XII
SRN 283 ἀμίαντος-amiantos

Ἀμίαντος (Amiantos), which is pronounced am-ee´-an-tos, occurs four times in the New Testament: Hebrews 7:26, Hebrews 13:4, I Peter 1:4, and Jacob 1:27, and five times in the Septuagint: Wisdom 3:13, Wisdom 4:2, Wisdom 8:20, and II Maccabees 14:36 and II Maccabees 15:34.

We look first at Hebrews 7:26, which reads in the King James Version:

> **"For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens;"**

We translated this verse before when discussing the word ἄκακος (akakos), and so we will only discuss our subject word in this context; for explanations on the rest of the words in this verse, see SRN 172 ἄκακος-akakos.[25]

This verse reads in the AST:

> **"For such a High Priest was appropriate for us: sacred, good in kind and pure, nonmongrelized, separated from failures, and becoming higher than the heavens."**

The word *nonmongrelized* is translated for ἀμίαντος (amiantos), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "undefiled, pure." The word *defilement*, according to *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*, means "pollution". In addition to this, the opposite and root of ἀμίαντος (amiantos) is μιασμός (miasmos), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "strictly to paint over a white body with another color, hence to stain, dye, to stain, defile, soil, esp. [especially] with

---

[25]See Chapter II SRN 172 ἄκακος-akakos.

blood, to taint, defile, pollute, murder." Here we find in clear and explicit language the meaning of this word: *to stain, defile, soil, especially with blood.* Remember that the word *defile* means *pollute,* and so this Greek word means *to pollute with blood.* This word had come to be used to describe the changing of the color of a white body to a darker color by an artist because of its common usage of describing race-mixing. This is easily understood when we read the first part of the definition – *to paint over a white body with another color.* We notice also that the word meant to *taint, pollute,* and *murder* according to Liddell and Scott. It is interesting to note that race-mixing was associated with murder. Because our word under examination, ἀμίαντος (amiantos), is the opposite of the word μιασμός (miasmos), then ἀμίαντος (amiantos) means *not polluted, not tainted, not polluted with,* or summed up in one word – *nonmongrelized.* In many translations, ἀμίαντος (amiantos) is translated by a term such as *undefiled,* a term that in archaic English clearly and explicitly meant *unpolluted, unmixed.*

Some may question why the author of Hebrews would use two synonymous adjectives, one after the other, to describe the same thing. Using two synonymous terms in the same context is not at all uncommon in Koine Greek. Paul uses a list of several synonymous terms in Philippians 2:15 (See SRN 185 ἀκέραιος-akeraios). We find contemporary nonbiblical evidence of this common literary style in Josephus, Contra Apion 1:7 (Thackeray):

> "Not only did our ancestors in the first instance set over this business men of the highest character, devoted to the service of God, but they took precautions to ensure that the preists' lineage should be kept unadulterated and pure [amikton καί katharon]. A member of the priestly order must, to beget a family, marry a woman of his own race, without regard to her wealth or other distinctions; but he must investigate her pedigree, obtaining the genealogy from the archives and producing a number of witnesses. And this practice of ours is not confined to the home country of Judaea, but wherever there is a Jewish

[Judean] colony, there too a strict account is kept by the priests of their marriages; I allude to the Jews [Judeans] in Egypt and Babylon and other parts of the world in which any of the priestly order are living in dispersion. A statement is drawn up by them and sent to Jerusalem, showing the names of the bride and her father and more remote ancestors, together with the names of the witnesses ... they also pass scrutiny upon the remaining women, and disallow marriage with any who have been taken captive, suspecting them of having had frequent intercourse with foreigners."

We find almost a parallel phrase in *unadulterated and pure,* which would be more correctly translated *unmixed and racially pure.* William Whiston translated these words as *unmixed and pure,* and it is obvious even in his translation that the context is racial, but he uses very archaic language as his translation was done in 1737. I would also like to point out a fallacy frequently argued by Judeos and Talmudists regarding the above passage and Leviticus 21:13-14 (LXX):

"He will take for himself a virgin woman of his own race. But a widow, or one that is put away, or profaned, or a whore, these he will not take; but he will take for himself a virgin woman of his own people."

Now the fallacy regards the interpretation of this and other passages and of the passage in Josephus. Judeos and Jews like to argue that priests had to marry someone of Israelite faith, and that race is not an issue, but that the woman be of the Hebrew faith. Only an idiot could read these passages and come up with that rationalization. The issue is clearly race; why else would the word *race* be used and why would pedigrees and documented family trees be necessary?

The next usage of ἀμίαντος (amiantos) we shall look at is in Hebrews 13:4, which reads in the King James Version:

"Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed

undefiled: but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge."

We will now look at a more accurate and literal translation of this verse in the AST:

"Marriage is honorable in all, and the marriage bed unmongrelized, but whores and mongrelizers God will judge."

Unmongrelized is translated for our subject word, ἀμίαντος (amiantos). *Whores* is translated for πόρνος (pornos), defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a fornicator, also a catamite." The word *mongrelizers* is translated for μοιχοὺς (moichous). Time and space does not here permit an exploration of this word, but it is the subject of Chapter XIV: SRN 3432 μοιχός (moichos). The word *judge* is translated for the Greek word κρινεῖ (krinei), defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to separate, divide, put apart, to decide, judge, to pass sentence upon, to condemn."

The next usage of our subject word we shall deal with is in I Peter 1:4, which reads in the King James Version:

"To an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you."

Now the AST:

"To an inheritance unmongrelizable and unmongrelized and unfading, having been kept in heaven for you."

The term *unmongrelizable* carries a similar concept to that of *unmongrelized*, but they are not synonymous, in that *unmongrelized* denotes that the subject matter *could have been* mongrelized, *can be* mongrelized, or *can* mongrelize. However, unmongrelizable denotes that the subject matter *could not have been* mongrelized, *cannot be* mongrelized and *cannot*

mongrelize. The word *unmongrelizable* is translated for the Greek word afqarton ἄφθαρτον (aphtharton) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "uncorrupted, incorruptible, immortal." In order to determine the actual meaning of this word, we must look at its opposite and derivative, φθείρω (phtheiro), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "To corrupt, spoil, ruin, kill, of a maiden, to debauch, deflower her, colors, to mix together." A complete discussion of the definition of this word is contained elsewhere in this book and also in Appendix 10 of the Anointed Standard Translation. This word is used in Romans 1:23 in much the same way as the *unmongrelizable* God. The word *unmongrelized* is translated for our subject word, ἀμίαντος (amiantos).

The next usage we shall examine is in Jacob (James) 1:27, which reads in the King James Version:

> **"Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world."**

We look now at a more accurate and literal translation of this passage in the AST:

> **"Religion purified and of the unmongrelized before God and the Father is this: to visit the orphans and widows in their affliction, keeping himself unspotted from the world."**

The word *unmongrelized* is translated for our subject word ἀμίαντος (amiantos). Here it is used as a noun, not an attribute or adjective. Accordingly, we have added the words *of the* in our translation to make it clearer. The word *purified* is translated for καθαρός (katharos), discussed elsewhere in this book. The word *unspotted* is translated for the Greek word ἄσπιλον (aspilon), defined by Liddell and Scott as: "without stain, spotless, pure." Here it must suffice to say that ἄσπιλον (aspilon) is used in a metaphorical sense denoting sexual

activity as well as racial purity. This word is also used in I Peter 1:19 and II Peter 3:14. The opposite of ἄσπιλον (aspilon) is σπίλος (spilos) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a spot, stain, blemish, Att. [Attic Form:] κηλίς [kelis]." As Liddell and Scott state, the Attic form of this word is κηλίς (kelis), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a stain, spot, defilement, e.g. blood, etc., a blot, blemish, disgrace." It is clear that the Christians used the term ἄσπιλον (aspilon) in reference to *racial purity*, as Sophocles used its opposite in reference to *racial impurity*. In the street language of Hellenstic Palestine, it came to connote keeping oneself *untainted* and *unmongrelized*, therefore emphasizing our subject word to carry an even more pronounced racial connotation.

These are all of the New Testament usages of ἀμίαντος (amiantos). We look now at the Septuagint usages, starting with Wisdom 3:13, which reads in Brenton's translation:

"Their offspring is cursed. Wherefore blessed is the barren that is undefiled, which hath not known the sinful bed: she shall have fruit in the visitation of souls."

We look now at a more accurate translation:

"Their race is yet cursed. Therefore blessed is the barren that did not mongrelize, which has not known the bed of transgression, she shall have fruit in the visitation of lives."

Brenton's translation of this verse was fairly accurate, it merely needed updating. The word *race* is translated for the Greek word γένεσις (genesis) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "an origin, source, birth, race, descent." The words *not mongrelized* are translated for our subject word ἀμίαντος (amiantos).

We now look at Wisdom 4:2-3, which reads in Brenton's translation:

"When it is present, men take example at it; and

when it is gone, they desire it, it weareth a crown, and triumpheth for ever, having gotten the victory striving for undefiled rewards. For the multiplying brood of the ungodly shall not thrive, nor take deep rooting from bastard slips, nor lay any fast foundation."

Let us now look at a more accurate translation:

"When it is present, men imitate it, and when it is gone, they desire it, it forever wears a wreath, and leads the unmongrelized battling for the reward of victory. But the multiplying race of the ungodly will not be of great number nor gain power through mongrels propagating, nor will that race be allowed to advance nor accomplish a secure foundation."

As you see, Brenton's translation of this verse is very poor. We shall have to deal with each phrase of our translation, as Brenton's translation does not even provide an outline.

The phrase *When it is present, men imitate it,* is translated for the Greek words παροῦσάν τε μιμοῦνται αὐτὴν (parousan te mimountai auten).

The phrase *and when it is gone, they desire it* is translated for the Greek words καί ποθοῦσιν ἀπελθοῦσαν (kai pothousin apelthousan).

The phrase *it forever wears a wreath, and leads,* is translated for the Greek words καί ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι στεφανηφοροῦσα πομπεύει (kai en to aioni stephanephorousa pompeuei).

The phrase *the unmongrelized battling for the reward of victory* is translated for the Greek words τὸν τῶν ἀμιάντων ἄθλων ἀγῶνα νικήσασα (ton ton amianton athlon agona nikesasa).

The word *unmongrelized* is our subject word and is translated for ἀμίαντος (amiantos).

Now with verse three, the phrase *But the multiplying race of the ungodly will not be of great number* is translated for the Greek words Πολύγονον δὲ ἀσεβῶν πλῆθος οὐ (Polugonon de asebon plethos ou). The words *multiplying race* are translated for the Greek word πολύγονον (polugonon) which is a

combination of πολύς (polus), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "many, to increase, large", and γόνος (gonos), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "that which is begotten, offspring, race, birth, descent."

The phrase *nor gain power through mongrels propagating* is translated for the Greek words κρεσιμεύσει καί ἐκ νόθων μοσχευμάτων (chresimeusei kai ek nothon moscheumaton). The word *mongrels* is translated for the Greek word νόθων (nothon), the subject of the next chapter, and is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a bastard, base born, any child born of a foreign woman, spurious, counterfeit, adulterated." The word *propagating* is translated for the Greek word μοσχευμάτων (moscheumaton) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to plant a sucker, propagate." The last phrase, *nor will that race be allowed to advance nor accomplish a secure foundation* is translated for the Greek words οὐ δώσει ρίζαν εἰς βάθος, οὐδὲ ἀσφαλῆ βάσιν ἑδράσει (ou dosei rizan eis bathos, oude asphale basin edrasei). The word *race* in this phrase is translated for the Greek word ρίζαν (rizan) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "root, stock, race, family."

We look now at Wisdom 8:20, which reads in Brenton's translation:

> **"Yea rather being good, I came into a body undefiled."**

Let us look now at a more accurate translation of this verse:

> **"But most of all, being good in my kind, I came into a nonmongrelized body."**

The words *most of all* are translated for the word μᾶλλον (mallon) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "most, most strongly, most of all, especially, for the most part, mostly." *Good in my kind* is translated for the Greek word ἀγαθὸς (agathos) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "good in its kind, noble, virtuous, good in their kind." The word

nonmongrelized is translated for our subject word ἀμίαντος (amiantos).

We look next at is in II Maccabees 14:36, which reads in Brenton's translation:

> **"Therefore now, O holy Lord of all holiness, keep this house ever undefiled, which lately was cleansed, and stop every unrighteous mouth."**

This translation is fairly accurate. The word *undefiled* should be rendered *unmongrelized* and is translated for our subject word ἀμίαντος (amiantos). The last Biblical usage of our subject word occurs in II Maccabees 15:34, and reads in Brenton's translation:

> **"So every man praised toward the heaven, the glorious Lord, saying, Blessed be he that hath kept his own place undefiled."**

Once again, this is a fairly accurate translation. The word *undefiled* is our subject word, translated for ἀμίαντος (amiantos) which should be rendered *unmongrelized*.

XIII
SRN 3541 νόθος-nothos

Νόθος (nothos) which is pronounced no´-thoce, occurs only once in the New Testament in Hebrews 12:8, and three times in the Septuagint: Wisdom 4:3, Wisdom 14:24, and III Maccabees 3:17. We will look first at Hebrews 12:8, which reads in the King James Version:

"But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons."

We look now at the more accurate and literal translation of the Anointed Standard:

"But if you are without chastisement, of which all have become sharers, then you are mongrels and not sons."

We see that the King James Version's translation of this verse is fairly accurate. The word *chastisement* is translated for the Greek word παιδείας (paideias), from the root word παιδεία (paideia), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "*rearing of a child, training and teaching, education, mental culture, learning, education, parts* or *systems of education, culture* of trees, the twisted *handiwork* of Egypt, *ropes of papyrus, anything taught* or *learned, art, science* of medicine, *chastisement, youth, childhood.*" In the previous verse, the verbal form παιδεύει (paideuei) in the present active indicative tense, 3rd person singular was used. From the root word παιδεύω (paideuo), this word means, according to Liddell and Scott: "*to bring up* or *rear a child, to train, teach, educate, to teach,* hence in Pass., *to be taught* a thing, *to have* any one *taught, cause* him *to be educated, to correct, discipline, to chastise, punish.*"

The word *mongrels* is translated for the Greek word νόθοι (nothoi), nominative plural masculine of νόθος (nothos), the subject of this chapter. Νόθος (nothos) is defined by Liddell

and Scott as: "a bastard, base born, any child born of a foreign woman, spurious, counterfeit, adulterated." Νόθος (nothos) is the product or end result of νοθεύω (notheuo) which is defined by G.W.H. Lampe as to, "corrupt, seduce, adulterate." Lampe defines νόθος (nothos) as "bastard, counterfeit, not genuine, adulterated, spurious, cross-bred."

The words cross-bred are defined by *Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary* as: "produced by the union of different varieties, breeds, or races, mongrel." *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* adds: "produced by interbreeding two pure but different breeds." By using the term *cross-bred*, Lampe makes very clear the meaning of this word. Thayer defines the word νόθος (nothos) as: "illegitimate, bastard." Bauer defines the word νόθος (nothos) as: "born out of wedlock, illegitimate, (opp. [opposed to] γνήσιος [gnesios]."

As Bauer stated, the opposite of νόθος (nothos) is γνήσιος (gnesios), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "Belonging to the true race, legitimate, opp. [opposed to] νόθος [nothos], genuine, true, lawful, true, to have a noble mind." Did you hear what Liddell and Scott said, "Belonging to the true race" as opposed to what? Is not the implication of such a statement that there is a race that is *not* true, *not* natural, but as Jesus said, of their father the Devil or Diabolical One (John 8)? For a fuller explanation of γνήσιος (gnesios) refer again to Chapter X.

We find the most remarkable evidence for the meaning of νόθος (nothos) in *Cassell's New Latin Dictionary*, where under the entry for the Latin word *nothus* we find the following: "(νόθος [nothos]) illegitimate, bastard, of mixed breed, hybrid, mongrel, not genuine, spurious." *Ainsworth's Latin Dictionary* gives this definition for the Latin word *nothus*: "of mixed or bastard breed or kind, illegitimate."

In this verse (Hebrews 12:8) in the KJV, we see that νόθος (nothos) was translated as *bastard*, and we also find this in the definitions given by other scholars. What then did the word *bastard* mean to Liddell and Scott when they gave that as their definition in 1846?

Bastard. The word bastard was used for at least five

centuries as a common term denoting a mongrel. We find that in the Hebrew Old Testament the Hebrew word *mamzer* (which is defined by James Strong's *Exhaustive Concordance* as "a mongrel") was translated as *bastard* in the King James Version, and that in the Septuagint the Hebrew word *mamzer* was translated as ἀλλογενής (allogenes), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "of another race." Now the word ἀλλογενής (allogenes) is a combination of ἄλλος (allos) which means *other* and γένος (genos) which means *race*, thus meaning *of another race*.

In addition to this, the word *bastard* is defined by *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* in this way: "of inferior breed or stock, mongrel, hybrid, low bred." The word *bastard* is from the Old French word *bastart*, which means *a barn*. When this word was applied in English it came to be used of animals, and eventually with its usage applied to people, it connoted an animal-man, or a cross between animal and man. Later, the word came to be used solely as a descriptive term for mongreled people. We see in Ainsworth's definition for *nothus*: "of mixed or bastard breed or kind." In this definition we see that Ainsworth understood *bastard* to be synonymous with *mixed*.

Today, the word *bastard* no longer connotes, in the mind of the average man, the idea of *a mongrel*. So how do we know that it connoted this at the time of the translation of the King James Version? We learn this from the English word *bastarda*. *Bastarda* was a 15th-17th century term that carried the meaning of a Gothic Script: "having mixed cursive and book hand features and characterized by flourishes and hairlines," according to *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*. This word is no longer used today. It came into use when the Italians applied their word for *bastard* – *bastardo* – to an Old German typeface, and used the term because it was a mixing of features from two distinct typeface families. Later, this word was used in England under the spelling of *bastarda*. This tells us that in 1611 England, the word *bastard* still carried the connotations of something *mixed* or *a mongrel*.

Thus, when the Greek lexicons define the word νόθος

(nothos) as a *bastard*, this is just a euphemism for *a mongrel*. The word *bastard* conveyed the idea of *a mongrel* to the men who made these definitions, much like the word *bastard* conveys the idea of mongrel dog to dog-breeders today, and over the years, various translators have come up with a variety of other euphemisms to try and express the Greek word νόθος (nothos) without being honest enough to use the word *mongrel*. For example, Josephus has the following to say about Simon and John, the rulers of the Edomites and the Zealots at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD:

> "To narrate their enormities in detail is impossible; but, to put it briefly, no other city ever endured such miseries, nor since the world began has there been a generation more prolific in crime. Indeed they ended by actually disparaging the Hebrew race, in order to appear less ungodly in so treating aliens, and owned themselves, what indeed they were, slaves, the dregs of society and the mongrelizing mongrels of the nation. It was they who otherthrew the city, and compelled the reluctant Romans to register so melancholy a triumph, and all but attracted to the temple the tardy flames. Verily, when from the upper town they beheld it burning, they neither grieved nor shed a tear, though in the Roman ranks these signs of emotion were detected" (The Jewish War, V:442-445).

Now the words *mongrelizing mongrels* are translated for the Greek words νόθα φθάρματα (notha phtharmata). These two Greeks words have been translated in a variety of ways by different translators: Thackeray translated them as *bastard scum*; Traill as *spurious and polluted spawn*; and Whiston as *spurious and abortive offspring*. The most honest of the translation for νόθος (nothos) is Traill's *polluted spawn*, but even this is nothing more than a euphemism for *mongrels*. In this passage, Josephus was talking about the Edomites who are known historically to have been mongrel descendants of Cain who had usurped the place of the true Israelite Judeans at the time of Judas Maccabee. Jesus told these Edomite

mongrels in John 8:44 (AST):

> **"You are of your father the Diabolical One, and the lusts of your father you wish to do. That one was a murderer from the beginning, and he has not stood in the truth because there is no truth in him."**

Now when reading this account in John, we find that the Edomite Jews were claiming to be descendants of Abraham, but Jesus told them that they were not, that they were of their father the Devil or Diabolical One. The Edomite Jews said to Jesus,

> **"We were not born of whoredom; we have one father, God"** (John 8:41 AST).

The mongrel Jews who said this had to be in reference to Deuteronomy 23:2-3, which reads in the Septuagint:

> **"One born of a whore shall not enter into the Body Politic of the Master: the Ammanite and Moabite shall not enter into the Body Politic of the Master, even until the tenth generation he shall not enter into the Body Politic of the Master, even for ever."**

It is clear that the phrase *one born of a whore* implied a *mongrel* to the first century, Septuagint-reading Israelites, because in the Hebrew, this phrase is represented by the word *mamzer*, which, as we have already said, is defined by Strong's as "a mongrel" and is translated as *a bastard* in the King James Version. So, the Edomite Jews were claiming that they were not mongrels, but that they were pure Israelites. However, Jesus told them that if they were racially pure Israelites, they would love Him; yet, He said that they did not because they were of their father the Devil.

Thus, there can be no doubt that the Greek word νόθος (nothos) means *a mongrel*.

We will look now at the two Septuagintal occurrences of

νόθος (nothos), beginning with Wisdom 4:3, which reads in Sir Lancelot Brenton's translation:

"For the multiplying brood of the ungodly shall not thrive, nor take deep rooting from bastard slips, nor lay any fast foundation."

Let us now look at a more accurate translation:

"But the multiplying race of the ungodly will not be of great number nor gain power through mongrels propagating, nor will that race be allowed to advance nor accomplish a secure foundation."

Brenton's translation of this verse is very poor, and so by way of explanation we shall break the verse down phrase by phrase. The phrase *But the multiplying race of the ungodly will not be of great number* is translated for the Greek words Πολύγονον δὲ ἀσεβῶν πλῆθος οὐ (Polugonon de asebon plethos ou). The words *multiplying race* are translated for the Greek word πολύγονον (polugonon) which is a combination of πολύς (polus), defined by Liddell and Scott as: "many, to increase, large", and γόνος (gonos), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "that which is begotten, offspring, race, birth, descent." The phrase *nor gain power through mongrels propagating* is translated for the Greek words χπησιμεύσει καί ek νόθων μοσχευμάτων (chresimeusei kai ek nothon moscheumaton). The word mongrels is translated for our subject word νόθων (nothon). The word propagating is translated for the Greek word μοσχευμάτων (moscheumaton) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to plant a sucker, propagate." The last phrase *nor will that race be allowed to advance nor accomplish a secure foundation* is translated for the Greek words οὐ δώσει ρίζαν εἰς βάθος οὐδὲ ἀσφαλῆ βάσιν ἑδράσει (ou dosei rizan eis bathos oude asphale basin edrasei). The word *race* in this phrase is translated for the Greek word ρίζαν (rizan) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "root, stock, race, family."

We look next at Wisdom 14:24 which reads in Brenton's translation:

"They kept neither lives nor marriages any longer undefiled: but either one slew one another traitorously or grieved him by adultery."

We look now at a more accurate and literal translation of this verse:

"They preserved neither lives nor marriages in racial purity, but either one ambushed another, or painfully mongrelized in the conception of the womb."

The word *preserved* is translated for the Greek word φυλάσσουσιν (phulassosusin) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to watch, to guard, defend, keep, secure, preserve, keep, maintain." The words racial purity are translated for the Greek word καθαρός (katharos) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "clean, pure, spotless, clear, open, free, cleanhanded, pure, clean, free from guilt or defilement, pure, unmixed, bright, clear, pure, unadulterated, without blemish in its kind, spotless, faultless, to be of pure blood." For a complete explanation of this word, refer back to Chapter 8. Brenton translated καθαρός (katharos) *undefiled* in his translation of Wisdom 14:24. The word *ambushed* is translated for the Greek word λοχῶν (lochon) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "an ambush, ambuscade." The word *painfully* is translated for the Greek word ὀδυνᾷ (oduna) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to cause pain or suffering, to pain, distress, to feel pain, suffer."

Finally, the word *mongrelized* is translated for our subject word νόθος (nothos). In this instance the actual Greek word is νοθεύων (notheuon).

While νόθος (nothos) and νοθεύων (notheuon) are essentially the same word and share the same meaning, there is however, a slight difference. As we said when defining νόθος (nothos), νόθος (nothos) is the product or end result of

νοθεύων (notheuon) which is defined by Lampe as: "corrupt, seduce, adulterate." So, νοθεύων (notheuon) is the actual *act of mongrelizing*, while νόθος (nothos) is the *product or the mongrel* that comes into being after the act of mongrelizing takes place.

Thus, in this verse, we have translated νοθεύων (notheuon) as *mongrelized*, accentuating the act that takes place, not the end result. The phrase, *conception of the womb* is translated for the Greek word ἀναιρεῖ (anairei) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to conceive in the womb."

It should be noted that Mr. Brenton does inadvertently make a contribution to our etymological understanding of the word *adultery*, as used at the time of his translation in 1836. Obviously Mr. Brenton equated *adultery* with νοθεύων (notheuon) or *mongrelization*, since this was the way he translated it.

We find evidence as to the exact scientific meaning of νόθος (nothos) in its application of cross-breeding species in Philo's *The Special Laws*, III:46, which reads in F.H. Colson's translation:

> "Actually so great is the provisions made in the law to ensure that men should admit [allow] no unlawful matings, that it ordains that even cattle are not to be crossed with others of a different species [race]. No Jewish [Judean] shepherd will allow a he-goat to mount a ewe or a ram a she-goat, or a bull a mare, or if he does he will be punished as an offender against the decree of nature, who is careful to preserve the primary species [race] without adulteration [mongrelization]."

The last word in this passage, *adulteration*, is translated for our subject word νόθος (nothos), and would be more plainly translated *mongrelization*. Here it is inescapable that νόθος (nothos) is in reference to *the crossing of species or races*. Also, once again, this translator contributes to the understanding of what *adultery* truly is, for he has translated a word that clearly means *mongrelization* as *adulteration*.

Having amassed this body of etymological evidence that

proves without a doubt that the word νόθος (nothos) means *mongrel* both in the true Old Testament Septuagint and what we call the New Testament, or the Christian Scriptures, it behooves us to once again return to our New Testament citation and consider the implication of the statement in Hebrews.

Before doing so however, we should note that when we say the Old Testament, we are in reference to what Christ and His Apostles called the Scriptures, meaning the Greek Septuagint. The Septuagint was the only Scripture that Christ and His Apostles recognized as legitimate, and this is understandable when we realize that the so-called Hebrew Scriptures, the Masoretic Text, did not exist until 1050 AD, and was actually thrust upon the world by the Talmudic Jews who later conveniently changed their name to Masoretes. This fact may be verified in any encyclopedia.

Thus, our New Testament citation reads in the Anointed Standard Translation:

> **"But if you are without chastisement, of which all have become sharers, then you are mongrels and not sons"** (Hebrews 12:8).

With a true translation of this verse, the implications of the twelfth chapter of Hebrews set forth two paramount Christian principles. First, that mongrels and races not of the true race cannot be Christians. Second, all true truth-loving, Mind of Christ-filled, obedient Christians will inevitably be called "racists," and because the whole world lies in deception, will no doubt suffer persecution from a godless world for this Biblical understanding. They will therewith be chastised and thereby become recipients of faithful, obedient character, infused in them by the Author and Finisher of the true faith of ancient Israel, the Master Jesus Christ.

Other principles might well be brought forward, but these points are presented simply to show how the enemies of truth have perverted the true words of God to present a watered-down version of true Christianity. When we realize how one

word can change the intent and principles taught in an entire chapter, then we would do well to question the foundation of our faith and especially those judaized, so-called authorities who now ask the white race and black race to commit racial murder and suicide, and to accept deviants, perverts, sodomites, and lesbians as Christians. Such doctrines are defined by God Himself as pure blasphemy.

XIV
SRN 3432 μοιχός-moichos

Before going on to discuss μοιχός (moichos), usually translated as adultery by Judeo scholars, we must first discuss the various spellings and deriviations we are encompassing under this single spelling, for it is in this area that the godless Judeo and Humanist theologians have manipulated the facts to deceive millions. Basically stated, any Greek word that contains the syllable μοιχ- (moich-) either as a suffix, prefix, or between a suffix and prefix, is rooted to this word, μοιχός (moichos). All of these various forms of the word share the same basic definition, although some forms are combined with other Greek prefixes or suffixes to incorporate an additional concept. Most Greek lexicons list the several different forms of the word and attempt to give a definition for each, although always reminding that the different forms are traced back to μοιχός (moichos). On the other hand, the Analytical Greek Lexicon gives a definition only for μοιχός (moichos), and simply makes mention of the fact that the other forms are etymologically traced to μοιχός (moichos). Thus, it becomes important to determine what the Greek word μοιχός (moichos) means, and the definitions of its derivatives will become obvious.

In Greek literature as a whole, there are several hundred forms and spellings of μοιχός (moichos), but most narrow this massive group down to five root words since the other forms are merely a matter of inflection. They are: first, μοιχός (moichos), as the root of the other four; second, μοιχαλίς (moichalis); third, μοιχάω (moichao); fourth, μοιχεία (moicheia); and fifth, μοιχεύω (moicheuo). In this chapter, to simplify the subject we shall treat all Biblical and non-Biblical occurrences of any of the different spellings and derivatives under the word μοιχός (moichos). We will however, where it is necessary, explore the different forms.

Below we see a partial list of the various inflectional forms used in the New Testament and Septuagint:

μοιχαλὶς
μοιχαλίδες
μοιχάομαι
μοιχασθε
μοιχωμένους
μοιχείαν
ἐμοιχευθε
μοιχεύειν
μοιχεύων
μοιχεύωσιν
μοιχεύσης
μοιχευθῆναι
μοιχὸν
μοιχοὺς
μοιχαλὶν
μοιχαλίδι
ἐμοιχατο
μοιχαται
μοιχεία
μοιχεύω
ἐμοιχωντο
μοιχεύεις
μοιχεύοντας
μοιχεύουσι
μοιχεύσηται
μοιχός
μοιχῶνται
μοιχαλίδα
μοιχαλίδος
μοιχασθαι
μοιχωμένη
μοιχείαι
ἐμοιχευσα
μοιχεύει
μοιχευομένη
μοιχοῦ
μοιχεύσεισ
μοιχεύσουσι
μοιχοί
μοιχῶν

Μοιχός (moichos), which is pronounced moy´-khos, occurs thirty-five times in the Greek of the King James New Testament or Textus Receptus (Matthew 5:27, 28, 32 (x2); 12:39; 15:19; 16:4; 19:9 (x2), 18; Mark 7:21; 8:38; 10:11, 12, 19; Luke 16:18 (x2); 18:11, 20; John 8:3, 4; Romans 7:3 (x2); 2:22 (x2); 13:9; I Cor. 6:9; Hebrews 13:4; Galatians 5:19; Jas. 2:11 (x2); 4:4 (x2); II Peter 2:14; Rev. 2:22) and thirty-six times in the Septuagint (Ex. 20:13; Lev 20:10 (x3); Deuteronomy 5:18; Job 24:15; Psalms 49:18; Proverbs 6:32; 18:22; 24:55; Wisdom 3:16; 14:26; 17:4; Sirach 23:23; 25:2; Hosea 2:2; 3:1; 4:2; 4:13, 14; 7:4; Ma. 3:5; Jeremiah 3:8, 9; 5:7; 7:9; 9:2; 13:27; 23:14; 36:23; Isaiah 57:3; Ezekiel 16:32, 38; 23:37 (x2), 43 (x2)). We will examine all of these occurrences and also look at non-Biblical occurrences of μοιχός (moichos).

We look first at the definitions assigned μοιχός (moichos) by the recognized Judeo scholars: Liddell and Scott define μοιχός (moichos) as: "an adulterer, paramour, debaucher, Lat. [Latin] moechus." Lampe defines μοιχάομαι (moichaomai), which is the futuristic form of μοιχός (moichos), as: "debauch, adulterate." We find that most all lexicons give either the definition of *adultery* or *adulterate*. What then does *adultery* and *adulterate* mean?

Adultery, Adulterate. *Adultery* is the noun form of *adulterate* which is defined by *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* as: "to corrupt, debase, or make impure, by the addition of a foreign substance." This was the connotation it expressed in 1611 when the King James Version was translated. Our English lexicons, all of which were compiled after the translation of the King James Version, were influenced in their defining process to overwhelmingly use the term *adultery* usually with no further explanation. This is also true of the word *bastard*, and it is interesting to note that in most people's minds, including the minds of the King James Version Translators, a *bastard* is the result of an adulterous relationship, and a *bastard* is a *mongrel*, as has been proven in Chapter 13. According to *The New Century Dictionary*, the word *adultery* is from the Latin word *adulter* which is defined by Ainsworth's as: "an adulterer, [once again merely giving the English derivative] debauched, mixed." Ainsworth's defined the Latin word *adulteratus* as: "debauched, defiled, sophisticated, adulterated or mixed, opp. to sincerus." We learn from this definition that Ainsworth associated *adulterated* with *mixed*, and we see that the opposite of the Latin word *adulteratus* is *sincerus*. The Latin word *sincerus* is defined by Cassell's as "pure, unmixed, whole, sound, genuine" (For more information on *sincerus*, see Chapter 1). Ainsworth defines *adultero* as: "to debauch or commit adultery with, to adulterate, mix or counterfeit, to corrupt."

The Anointed Standard Translation adds this to the etymology of adultery in Appendix 10 of the AST:

> "Now in Greek lexicons, virtually the only definition to be found of μοιχός is *adultery*. The reason for this is that the Vulgate and other early Latin translations of the Scriptures used the Latin words *adulterium* and *adulterare* to translate the Greek μοιχός. Then, through the centuries, the Latin word *adulterium* continued to be the definition of the Greek word. The English word *adultery* is actually derived from the French descendant of the Latin word, *avoutrie*, but Latin influence has changed our spelling back to where it is closer to the Latin. Early English

translations merely transliterated the Latin word into the translation and early Greek lexicons began to use both the Latin word and the English word *adultery* to define μοιχός. Thus, today, the only definition available for the word is *adultery*. So the question now becomes, What did the Latin word *adulterare* mean when it was adopted as the Latin equivalent of the Greek μοιχός? *Adulterare* was a compound of the prefix ad which means "to" or "at" and the adjective alter which means "different" or "other." The raw etymological meaning of the verb then was *to make different, to alter*. This developed into the meaning *to make impure, to pollute*, or, using the English etymological descendent, *to adulterate*."

Even with all of this evidence, one may question whether the Latin word *adultero* was actually used of *cross-breeding*. We find this proof in Horace where he says "adulteretur et columba miluo," which literally says in English, according to Cassell's translation of the citing, "let the kite wed the dove." He has here translated *adulteretur* as *wed* but we see that it is indicative of *cross-breeding* and would be correctly translated as such, because a kite is a hawk and a dove is a pigeon, two different types of birds, which under normal and natural circumstances are incompatible and cannot be compelled to cross species. Still, one may ask what the relevance of the Latin origins of the words *adultery* and *adulterate* is on the definition of μοιχός (moichos)? It is relevant because the Old Middle English word *adulterie*, the form used at the time of the translating of the King James Version, had just recently been taken from the Latin. The newly coined English word was still in its infancy, and its definition was still that of the scholars' Latin language. It was then decided that the Greek word μοιχός (moichos) was best defined as *adultery*, based on the Latin meaning of the word, and the King James Bible would help define in the minds of the public what this new term connoted. The only problem with this definition is that it was never updated with the evolution, or should I say, degeneration, of the English language.

We need not however rely upon the euphemistic language

of our translations and our lexicons. Both Biblical and non-Biblical usages of this group of words that we have assembled under the banner of μοιχός (moichos) confirm the true definition. Basically stated, we contend and will prove that the word μοιχός (moichos) means first and foremost: *mongrelization, the corruption of racial seedline, the act of mongrelizing,* and in a few instances, with the proper qualification provided by the context, μοιχός (moichos) also carries the meaning of the *corruption of seedline within the same race* so as to render impure the seedline of the husband, although the offspring of such a union may not be a mongrel or a bastard since the child belongs to the true divine race of God. As we have stated, this is the exception, not the rule, and only when the proper modifiers are present does this apply.

It is for this reason that we shall look at all of the Biblical usages. It is much like saying in English, *She corrupted his seedline;* this can be taken one of two ways. If the word μοιχός (moichos) was used in this manner in the Greek, the first and foremost thought that entered the reader's mind was that she corrupted his seedline through mongrelization. However, if the passage being read said, she corrupted his seedline, but the offspring was still racially pure, or she corrupted his seedline by bringing in a child by a man of the same race, then the reader would understand that the act of mongrelization did not take place, although it was equally the corruption of her husband's seedline. Both acts were illicit or illegal under the laws of ancient Israel as well as many surrounding nations. As I have said before, in the first instance, a child from an illicit, adulterated, mongrelized, race-mixed relationship could under no circumstances claim membership in the divine race and was therefore dead unto the living God because the act of adultery or mongrelization was a crossing over of the divine law of Israel, specifically the breaking of the sixth commandment, which, as we shall prove irrefutably hereafter, says *You will not mongrelize,* and for which there is no forgiveness or way to make amendment, but only the obligation of the divine race to administer the defined punishment as mandated by Almighty God.

On the other hand, in the second instance, while the act was illicit and illegal under social law because it created confusion in the Israelite society and robbed the girl and her family of their divine rights, the child of such a union could nevertheless continue to claim membership in the royal family or the divine race of Almighty God, and therefore became a ward of the state, since it legally had no father and was not a product of Holy Matrimony which in ancient Israel was a civil ceremony or act as opposed to a religious act. We shall endeavor to distinguish between these different uses of the word.

Some insight is provided also by the different spellings and forms of μοιχός (moichos). Even this rule only applies in the few instances where the passage is actually in reference to marriage. The overwhelming majority of citations would be defined as *the corruption of the seedline*, thus being in reference to the *corruption of the race*. We will now begin to define this word by the context in which it was used in the Greek language.

The most overwhelming proof of the meaning of μοιχός (moichos) is in Josephus. The works of Josephus, like the New Testament and Septuagint and virtually any other classical writing, are composed of dozens of different Greek texts. Although the different Greek texts are very close and all say basically the same thing, they are different by a few Greek words. These variant Greek texts came into being through manual copying and transmission, as there was no means of mass production of printed materials. Over the past four or five hundred years, different editors have sifted through these texts and performed critical comparisons to determine the most accurate text, trying to best arrive at the original words of the author. The two leading editions of Josephus are the text of Sigebertus Havercampus, and the edition of S.A. Naber. When we look at Josephus' *The Jewish Antiquities* 4:244, in Naber's text we find the Greek phrase, μὴ ζευγνύσθω συνοικοῦσαν ἄλλῳ μοιχεύσαας (me zeugnustho sunoikousan allo moicheusas). This same phrase reads in the text of Havercampus, μὴ ζευγνύσθω συνοικοῦσαν ἄλλῳ

νοθεύσας (me zeugnustho sunoikousan allo notheusas)." We notice that in Naber's text we find the word μοιχεύσαας (moicheusas), the 2nd person singular aorist 1, subjunctive mood of μοιχεύω (moicheuo), the future tense of μοιχός (moichos), our subject word. However, in Havercampus' text, we find in place of μοιχός (moichos) the Greek word νοθεύσας (notheusas) the verbal form of νόθος (nothos), the subject word of Chapter 13.

This indicates two things: first, that the two words are synonymous terms, and second, that they were interchanged freely among different texts of Josephus by scribes and copyists. Such interchanging of synonymous terms was done frequently by scribes and copyists because many terms where colloquial and were only understood in a certain region; therefore, scribes felt that interchanging a synonymous term native to their region would promote greater understanding. We must remember that the early Greeks did not have the luxury of just simply looking a word up in the "Webster's Greek Dictionary," and because of the many distinct dialects of Greek, scribes, who were always considered the most literate of the people, acted also as a form of translator. Also, it may have been an evolutionary change based upon time difference and not necessarily geographical difference. It is much the same as today when an editor prepares a new copy of Shakespeare. When we read Shakespeare in modern literature books, in most cases we are reading a slightly modified edition because modern English speaking people would be incapable of understanding original Shakespearean language.

Thus, these two Greek words share the same meaning, and we can determine the meaning of one simply by looking at the other. As we have proven in Chapter 13, νόθος (nothos) means, unequivocally, *mongrel*, and in the verbal sense, *mongrelize* or *mongrelized*. This passage of Josephus reads in a translation by J. Thackeray:

> "Let young men, on reaching the age of wedlock, marry virgins, freeborn and of honest parents. He that will not espouse a virgin must not unite himself to a woman

living with another man, corrupting her . . ."

This passage would more correctly read:

"But in the age of marriage, marry a free virgin, good in race, but do not intend to take one not a virgin who is living and yoking with another and mongrelizing."

We see here that Thackeray's translation is very free and not literal to the Greek text. The words *good in race* are translated for the Greek words γονέων ἀγαθόν (goneon agathon). Γονεων (Goneon) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "race, birth, descent." The word ἀγαθός (agathos) means, according to Liddell and Scott: "good in its kind," as previously discussed. The word *intend* is translated for the Greek word μέλλον (mellon) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "intend, inevitable, destined." The words *take one* are translated for the Greek word ἄγεσθαι (agesthai) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to take." The word *mongrelizing* is translated for a verbal form of νόθος (nothos) in Havercampus' text and for a verbal form of μοιχός (moichos) in Naber's text.

These two words would never have been interchanged if they were not understood to carry the same meaning by the early scribes and copyists, who as we have already stated, were some of the most literate men of the day.

The Bible itself repeatedly defines exactly what the word μοιχός (moichos) means. We look first at Hosea 4:2, which reads in Brenton's translation:

"Cursing, and lying, and murder, and theft, and adultery abound in the land, and they mingle blood with blood."

Let us look now at a more accurate and literal translation of this verse:

"Cursing, and lying, and murder, and stealing, and

mongrelization pour out in the earth, for they mix blood with blood."

In this verse the word *mongrelization* is translated for our subject word μοιχός (moichos). The phrase for *they mix blood with blood* in the Greek is in reference to the last listed attribute, specifically μοιχός (moichos) or *mongrelization* and is an explanatory phrase that modifies the word μοιχός (moichos) or *mongrelization*.

We look next at Wisdom 3:16, which reads in Brenton's translation:

"As for the children of adulterers, they shall not come to their perfection, and the seed of an unrighteous bed shall be rooted out."

We look now at a better translation of this verse:

"Children of mongrelizers are not perfect, and the seed of an illegal bed shall disappear."

This verse is very pertinent as to the meaning of μοιχός (moichos) because the phrase *seed of an illegal bed* implies *illegal seed*. When we understand that the Greek word σπέρμα (sperma), from which *seed* is translated, carries the meaning of: "seed, offspring, origin, descent, family,"(Liddell and Scott) or *of racial descent*, or *seedline*, then we find that the connotation of *illegal racial descent* is implied in the Greek of this verse, although it is impossible to translate this concept into English and remain literal. Thus, μοιχός (moichos) or what is translated *mongrelizers or race-mixers* in this verse, is in reference to an illegal bed implying sexual activity and thus an illegal seed is its product. The word *illegal* is translated for the Greek word παρανόμου (paranomou) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "contrary to law and custom, unlawful, illegal."

We find additional evidence that this verse is in reference to racial seedline by examining verse 19 of the same chapter

that concludes this paragraph in the Greek. This verse reads in Brenton's translation:

> **"For horrible is the end of the unrighteous generation."**

Here the word *generation* is translated for the Greek word γενεὰς (geneas), the accusative plural of γενεά (genea), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "birth, race, descent, by blood, breed." The obvious connotation is that of an *unrighteous or illegal race or breed*. The conclusion that there is both an *illegal* and *legal race* or particular breed is inescapable. We look next at the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach or Ecclesiasticus 23:22-23, which reads in Brenton's translation:

> **"Thus shall it go also with the wife that leaveth her husband, and bringeth in an heir by another. For first, she hath disobeyed the law of the most High, and secondly, she hath trespassed against her own husband, and thirdly she hath played the whore in adultery, and brought children by another man."**

We look now at a more accurate and literal translation of this verse:

> **"And thus the woman that leaves her man, and brings in an inheritor by someone of another race. First, she hath disobeyed the law of the Highest, and secondly, offended her man, and thirdly, in her whoredom, she has mongrelized, bringing children by a man of another race."**

In this verse we see that the word μοιχός (moichos) is precisely defined and is in particular reference to the Ten Commandments. The word μοιχός (moichos) is translated *has mongrelized*, and this phrase is qualified with the words *bringing children by a man of another race*, and thus *sexual intercourse*, qualified by the word *whoredom*, with someone *of*

another race. Both times *of another race* occurs, it is translated for the Greek word ἀλλότριος (allotrios) which is often synonymous with ἀλλογενής (allogenes). The word ἀλλογενής (allogenes) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "of another race." The word ἀλλογενής (allogenes) is a combination of ἄλλος (allos) which means other and γένος (genos) which means race, thus meaning of another race. We know that the words ἀλλογενής (allogenes) and ἀλλότριος (allotrios) are synonymous because they are interchanged freely in the Septuagint, one instance of many being I Maccabees 3:36.

We see in this verse a separation of three distinct offenses. Her first offense was disobedience to God's law, both the sixth commandment and the laws regarding marriage, which constituted the national covenant. Her second offense was her offense to her husband's seedline. Her third offense was *mongrelization*, or what Brenton has translated *adultery*. Following Judeo logic, *adultery*, her third offense, would be the same as her second and even her first. If this were true, why then is there separation between the three, and why was it not enough to merely say that she committed *adultery*?

We look next at Hosea 4:13-14 which reads in Brenton's translation:

> **"They have sacrificed on the tops of the mountains, and on the hills they have sacrificed under the oak and poplar, and under the shady tree, because the shade was good, therefore your daughters shall go a-whorings, and your daughters-in-law shall commit adultery. And I will not visit upon your daughters when they shall commit fornication, nor your daughters-in-laws when they shall commit adultery: for they themselves mingled themselves with harlots, and sacrificed with polluted ones, and the people that understood not entangled themselves with a harlot."**

Let us look now at a more accurate translation of this passage:

"They have sacrificed on the tops of the mountains, and on the hills they have sacrificed under the oak and poplar, and under the shady tree, because the shade was good, therefore in their whoredom, your daughters and your daughters-in-laws shall commit mongrelization. And I will not acknowledge your daughters when in their whoring, and your daughters-in-law committing mongrelization, when they mix themselves together with whores, and sacrificed themselves to polluted and unclean ones, and the people who did not understand entangled themselves with whores."

There is not that large a difference in the translation of these two verses, the main discrepancy is the word order, and also we have translated the word μοιχός (moichos) using the real meaning, *mongrelization*. Brenton translated this verse with a preconceived idea of what μοιχός (moichos) meant and even though he knew the verse said *your daughters and your daughters-in-law shall commit* μοιχός (moichos), he still translated it incorrectly because this translation did not support his notion of what μοιχός (moichos) should mean. The reason for this is because it explicitly groups together daughters and daughters-in-law as the subject of the phrase with the verb being μοιχός (moichos). If μοιχός (moichos) simply meant adultery in the Judeo sense then it would only apply to daughters-in-law since they are the only ones that are implied to be married in the context. Brenton, when faced with such an obvious discrepancy, chose to translate this passage incorrectly. We also find later in the verse in both Brenton's and our translation the concept of *mixing* and *entangling with polluted ones*. Once again the connotations of this verse are obviously implying that there are unclean races and we find that Brenton has been willfully dishonest. Time and space will not permit a complete commentary. We therefore recommend the booklet entitled *The Racial War at Baal-Peor*, for those who wish a greater understanding of the depravity of the ancient love religions that required sexual sacrifice, usually with

mongrels.

We look next at Matthew 12:39 which reads in the King James Version:

"But he answered and said unto them, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas."

Let us look now at a the AST:

"But answering, He said to them, 'An evil race of mongrels seeks a sign, and a sign will not be given it, except the sign of Jonah the prophet.'"

The word evil is translated for the Greek word πονερὰ (ponera), the dative singular feminine of πονηρὸς (poneros). Πονηρὸς (poneros) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "causing toil or hardship, hurtful, unlucky, useless, good for nothing, weakly, bad, worthless, knavish, wicked, base, cowardly, like κακός [kakos]." The word πονηρὸς (poneros) has a very wide spectrum of meanings, and is translated according to usage. It can mean everything from *physical pain* to *wickedness* to *things bad in their kind*, because of its relationship with κακός (kakos). The word *mongrels* is translated for the Greek word μοιχαλίς (moichalis), one of the four basic derivatives of μοιχός (moichos) that we discussed earlier. The stupidity of Judeo logic is apparent when dealing with this verse because the Strong's Greek Lexicon, the most popular Judeo Greek lexicon, assigns the following definition for μοιχαλίς (moichalis): "an adulteress." Strong has herein applied a feminine gender to the word and if we used his definition we would end up with "a wicked race of adulteresses." The word *race* is translated for the Greek word γενεά (genea) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "birth, race, descent, by blood, breed; generation." Clearly, the verse is in reference to a race of mongrels who seek a sign, not to a race of women. The truth is, the verse is in reference to the

Edomite Jews.

We look next at Matthew 16:4 which reads in the King James Version:

"A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given unto it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas. And he left them and departed."

Let us look now at the AST:

"'An evil and mongrel race seeks a sign, and a sign will not be given it, except the sign of the prophet Jonah.' And leaving them behind, He went away."

This verse and Matthew 12:39 above are essentially the same. The passages were merely split into verses differently. The Greek for the parallel parts is identical, so we shall only deal with the last phrase. The word *leaving* is translated for the Greek word καταλιπὼν (katalipon), the nominative singular, masculine, participle, aorist second, active voice form of καταλείπω (kataleipo) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to forsake, abandon, to leave, or to give up to another." The theological question that the verse demands is, To whom did Jesus Christ give the Jews up to? The Bible answers, to their Father the Devil.

We look next at Mark 8:38 which reads in the King James Version:

"Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels."

Let us look now at a the Anointed Standard Translation:

"For whoever may be ashamed of Me and My words amidst this mongrel and failing race, the Son of man will

also be ashamed of him when He comes in the reputation of His Father with the separated messengers."

Here again, like the last two verses, we have the word γενεά (genea) which we have translated race and which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "birth, race, descent, by blood, breed." The word *mongrel* is translated for our subject word in the form of μοιχαλίδι (moichalidi), the dative singular of μοιχαλίς (moichalis), one of the four basic derivatives of our subject word μοιχός (moichos). The word *separated* is translated for the Greek word ἁγίων (hagion), the genitive plural of ἅγιως (hagios), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "devoted to the gods, sacred, holy, pious, pure." The word *messengers* is translated for the Greek word ἀγγέλων (angelon), the genitive plural of ἄγγελος (angelos), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a messenger, envoy, one that announces or tells." In addition to the important usage of μοιχός (moichos), we find also that the literal translation solves many eschatological problems posed by Judeos, for this verse emphatically declares that the way in which Christ is to ultimately come in the parousia is through His pure-race servants to establish government and justice.

We look next at Hebrews 13:4 which reads in the King James Version:

"Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled: but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge."

We will now look at the AST:

"Marriage is honorable in all, and the marriage bed unmongrelized, but whores and mongrelizers God will judge."

The word *unmongrelized* is translated for ἀμίαντος (amiantos), which is the subject word of Chapter 12. Remember that the opposite of ἀμίαντος (amiantos) is

μιασμός (miasmos), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "strictly to paint over a white body with another color, hence to stain, dye, to stain, defile, soil, esp. [especially] with blood, to taint, defile, pollute, murder." I will not go into further detail here but simply refer the reader to Chapter 12. Whores is translated for πόρνους (pornous), the accusative plural of πόρνος (pornos), defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a fornicator, also a catamite," and historically implying a *mongrel*. The word *mongrelizers* is translated for μοιχοὺς (moichous), the accusative plural of μοιχός (moichos). The word judge is translated for the Greek word κρινεῖ (krinei), the third person singular, present indicative, active voice form of κρίνω (krino), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to separate, divide, put apart, to decide, judge, to pass sentence upon, to condemn." However, it should be pointed out that the language, especially the tense in which it is written, demands the conclusion that the power which God uses for His divine separation or judgment is the power of His Word when it is obeyed by good and just men.

We look next at Wisdom 14:25-26 which reads in Brenton's translation:

"So that there reigned in all men without exception, blood, manslaughter, theft, and dissimulation, corruption, unfaithfulness, tumults, perjury, disquieting of good men, forgetfulness of good turns, defiling of souls, changing of kind, disorder in marriages, adultery, and shameless uncleanness."

Let us look now at a more accurate translation of these verses:

"And all are without distinction mixed in blood, and murder, theft and seduction, mongrelization, unpersuasion, confusion, lies, trouble for those good in kind, unable to remember favor, pollution of lives, race-changing, mongrelization, confusion in marriages, and raping."

Because Brenton's translation of this passage is so poor and willfully deceptive, we shall have to break it down and examine it phrase by phrase. The phrase *And all are without distinction mixed in blood* is translated for the Greek words πάντα δ᾽ ἐπιμὶξ ἔχει αἷμα (panta d epimix echei haima).

All is translated for the Greek word πάντα (panta) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "all, the whole, entire, all." In this reference, it is inclusive of all degenerates *mixed in blood.*

The next Greek word δ᾽ (d) is translated and and merely signifies continuation, as is illustrated in the definition given by *The Analytical Greek Lexicon*: "a conjunctive particle, marking the superaddition of a clause, whether in opposition or in continuation, to what has preceded, and it may be variously rendered."

The words *without distinction, mixed* are translated for the Greek word ἐπιμὶξ (epimix) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "mixedly, confusedly, indiscriminately." Ἐπιμὶξ (Epimix) is the adverb form of ἐπιμίγνυμι (epimignumi) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to mix in or with, to mingle with, to have intercourse or dealings with." Both are combinations of the prefix ἐπί- (epi-) and μίξις (mixis) and μίγνυμι (mignumi) respectively. Μίξις (mixis) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a mixing, mingling, intercourse with, esp. sexual intercourse." From this definition, and given the physical connotations of the verse, *by sexual intercourse* could be added to the translation because the word takes on a physical connotation by the presence of the word *blood.* Μίγνυμι (Mignumi) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to mix, mix up, mingle, join, bring together, to have intercourse with a person, to have intercourse with, to be united to, both of the man and the woman." It is from these two Greek words that the concept of *mix* and *mixing* has emanated into all major languages in various forms such as the German *mischen*, the Latin *misceo*, the Spanish *mixtura*, and our own English *mix*.

It should be pointed out at this stage that Brenton, in perhaps the apex of his dishonesty, failed to give <u>any</u> English word in translation of ἐπιμὶξ (epimix). He did not merely

translate it badly, but he did not translate it at all, leaving just the word *blood* by itself and a swarm of confused readers. It was not merely watered down or re-employed in a different part of the syntax, it is entirely omitted in Brenton's translation. Other respected translators simply watered the word down, such as Edgar J. Goodspeed's translation of this verse which reads *confusion of blood.*

Blood is translated for the Greek word αἷμα (haima) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as "blood."

The next phrase to be examined is *and murder, theft and seduction, mongrelization, unpersuasion, confusion* which is translated for the Greek words φόνος κλοπὴ καὶ δόλος φθορά ἀπιστία ταραχή (phonos klope kai dolos phthora apistia tarache).

Murder is translated for the Greek word φόνος (phonos) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "murder, homicide, slaughter." *Theft* is translated for the Greek word κλοπὴ (klope) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "theft." *And* is translated for καί (kai).

Seduction is translated for the Greek word δόλος (dolos) a noun form of δολόω (doloo) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to beguile, ensnare, counterfeit, adulterate." The word *beguile* and *seduce* are synonymous terms.

Mongrelization is translated for the Greek word φθορά (phthora) which is a derivative of φθείρω (phtheiro), and φθορά (phthora) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "seduction, mixing of colors." Bauer in his definition of φθορά (phthora) says the following: "w. [with] μοιχεία [moicheia] (Philo, Det. Pot. Ins. [Quod deterius potiorp insidiari soleat] 102) 2 Cl [II Clement] 6:4.)" Here Bauer is in reference to the fact that both Philo and Clement associated μοιχεία (moicheia), one of the four basic derivatives of μοιχός (moichos) and φθορά (phthora) as synonyms. Φθείρω (Phtheiro) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "To corrupt, spoil, ruin, kill, of a maiden, to debauch, deflower her, colors, to mix together." In 1846, at the time of Liddell and Scott's publication, the terms *debauch, deflower, corrupt,* and *spoil* all carried racial connotations, as any dictionary of the time will

confirm. For example, *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* says of the word *corrupt*: "corruption of blood." *Corrupt* carried the connotation of making impure, and one physical application of this would be corruption of blood. Φθείρω (phtheiro) later came to be used as an artist's term connoting the mixing of colors. Refer to the previous discussion of this word for more information in Chapter 5, SRN 572 ἁπλότης-haplotes.

The word *unpersuasion* is translated for the Greek word ἀπιστία (apisitia), the opposite of πίστις (pistis) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "faith, persuasion," and it is therefore in reference to having no faith or persuasion, and when used in the Bible always connotes a specific belief system of moral principles and laws. The words *confusion* are translated for the Greek word ταραχή (tarache) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "trouble, disorder, confusion."

The next phrase is *lies, trouble for those good in kind, unable to remember favor, pollution of lives* and it is translated for the Greek words ἐπιορκία θόρυβος ἀγαθόν χάριτος ἀμνησία ψυχῶν μιασμός (epiorkia thorubus agathon charitos amnesia psuchon miasmos).

The word *lies* is translated for the Greek word ἐπιορκία (epiorkia) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a false oath." The word *trouble* is translated for the Greek word θόρυβος (thorubus) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to make an uproar, to trouble, disturb." *For those good in kind* is translated for the Greek word ἀγαθὸς (agathon) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "good in its kind." The words *unable to remember* are translated for the Greek word ἀμνησία (amnesia) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to be unmindful, to forget." It is from this word that we get the English word *amnesia*. *Favor* is translated for the Greek word χάριτος (charitos) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "favour, grace."

The word *pollution* is translated for the Greek word μιασμός (miasmos) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "strictly to paint over a white body with another color, hence to stain, dye, to stain, defile, soil, esp. with blood, to taint,

defile, pollute, murder." Here we find, in clear and explicit language, the meaning of this word – *to stain, defile, soil, especially blood*; again, remember that the word *defile* means *to pollute*. Thus, μιασμός (miasmos) literally means *to pollute blood*, and the act of *polluting blood* is to *race-mix, amalgamate*, or *mongrelize*. Μιασμός (Miasmos) had come to be used to describe the act of an artist changing the color or coloring over a white statute or any physical activity of changing the color white to a darker color, and this included race-mixing. This word was consistently employed to denote either the act of race mixing or the product of race mixing in both the Septuagint and the New Testament. We notice also that the word μιασμός (miasmos) carried the meaning *to taint, pollute*, and *murder*. It is interesting to note that race-mixing was associated with murder, for in truth it is the act of genocide to both participating races. In this usage, however, it is used in the mental and not necessarily the physical sense by the presence of the word *lives* or *psyche*. However, the outcome of polluters of lives is mongrelized minds. The word *lives* is translated for the Greek word ψυχῶν (psuchon).

The last phrase of this passage is *race-changing, mongrelization, confusion in marriages, and rape."* and is translated for the Greek words γενέσεως ἐναλλαγή γάμων ἀταξία μοιχεία καί ἀσέλγεια (geneseos enallage gamon ataxia moicheia kai aselgeia).

Race is translated for the Greek word γενέσεως (geneseos) which means, according to Liddell and Scott: "race, descendant." The word *changers* is translated for the Greek word ἐναλλαγή (enallage) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to be changed to differ from." *Mongrelizing* is translated for μοιχεία (moicheia), one of the four basic derivatives of our subject word μοιχός (moichos). The words *confusion* is translated for the Greek word ἀταξία (ataxia) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "disorder, confusion." *In marriages* is translated for γάμων (gamon) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a wedding, marriage, wedlock." *And* is translated for καί (kai).

Finally, the word *rapings* is translated for the Greek word

ἀσέλγεια (aselgeia) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "intemperate, extravagant, excess in lusts and desires, lewd, to treat with brutal insolence or violence." It is implied by this word that the method used to fulfill excessive lusts and desires is through brutal insolence or violence, or *rape*, in modern terminology.

In Chapter 13, we translated the verse preceding these two, so putting the whole passage together we get a literal translation that reads like a modern commentary on the character of racial criminals and vindicates the Word of God as true and eternally relevant:

> **"They preserved neither lives nor marriages in racial purity, but either one ambushed another, or painfully mongrelized in the conception of the womb. And all are without distinction mixed in blood, and murderers, thieves, and seducers into mongrelization of those with no persuasion, causing confusion, liars, causers of trouble for those good in kind, unable to remember favor, polluters of lives, race-changers, mongrelizing causing confusion in marriages, and rapers"** (Wisdom 14:24-26).

We look next at Exodus 20:13 and Deuteronomy 5:18, and as we do so, we would do well to remember that we are discussing the codified law of the Most High God; both of these verses read in Brenton's translation:

> **"Thou shalt not commit adultery."**

We look now at a better translation of both of these verses:

> **"You will not mongrelize."**

This translation is exactingly literal. Actually the whole sentence is translated for only two Greek words: Οὐ μοιχεύσεις (Ou moicheuseis). In Latin, this phrase is *non adulterabis*. In both Greek and Latin we have a verb,

μοιχεύσεις (moicheuseis) and *adulterabis*, in the second person singular future indicative case, qualified by an adverb acting as a negative modifier, οὐ (ou) and *non*.

Thus, *you* for the second person singular, *will* for the future tense (*shall* is used only with first person, *will* is normally used only with second and third person), *not* for our negative adverb modifier οὐ (ou), and *mongrelize* for our verbal stem μοιχεύω (moicheuo), the future verbal form of μοιχός (moichos), our subject word. The Ten Commandments themselves prove at least circumstantially that μοιχός (moichos) finds its true definition in *mongrelize*, because of the redundancy contained in them, for the tenth commandment reads, *Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife*.

Many erroneously shorten this phrase to *Thou shalt not covet*, and this seems to be a fallacy promoted by the Talmudic Masoretic text, because the Masoretic text reads according to the King James Version: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet they neighbour's wife . . ." whereas the Septuagint reads according to Brenton's translation: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife; thou shalt not covet they neighbour's house . . ."

The inversion of these two phrases by the Masoretes can be nothing less than deliberate calculated deception to down-size the significance of the phrase *Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife*, which, in reality, is the tenth commandment. Furthermore, the word ἐπιθυμήσεις (epithumesies) translated as *covet* actually carries strong sexual connotations in its meaning of lust. This tenth commandment is the commandment forbidding what the Judeos call adultery, not the sixth commandment which emphatically forbids race-mixing. It is also of great import to understand that neighbor is a term qualified as within the race, and thus sexual activity outside of the race is prohibited by the sixth commandment, which as we have said states: "You will not mongrelize."

For the convenience of the reader, we shall state a correct translation of the codified laws of the Everliving God.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

1. **You will not have other gods besides me.**
οὐκ ἔσονταί σοι θεοὶ ἕτεροι πλὴν ἐμοῦ

2. **You will not make an idol.**
Οὐ ποιήσεις σεαυτῷ εἴδωλον

3. **You will not use the authority of the Master your God vainly.**
Οὐ λήψει τὸ ὄνομα
Κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ σου ἐπί ματαίῳ

4. **Remember the rest day to keep it separate.**
Μνήσθητι τὴν ἡμέρα τῶν
σαββάτων ἁγιάζειν αὐτήν

5. **Honor your father and your mother.**
τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου

6. 7 = Judeo **You will not mongrelize.**
Οὐ μοιχεύσεισ ου Moicheou

7. 8 **You will not steal.**
Οὐ κλέψεις

8. 6 **You will not murder.**
Οὐ φονεύσεις

9. **You will not bear false witness against your neighbor.**
Οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις κατὰ τοῦ πλησίον

10. **You will not lust after your neighbor's woman.**
οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον σου

Exodus 20:3-17

We look next at Matthew 5:27-28 which reads in the King James Version:

"Ye have heard that it was said of them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart."

Let us look now at the AST:

"You have heard that it was said to the ancients, 'You will not mongrelize or corrupt the seedline.' But I say to you, everyone looking at a woman to lust after her has already corrupted his seedline in his heart."

The ancients is translated for the Greek word ἀρχαῖοις (archaiois), the dative plural, masculine of ἀρχαῖος (archaios) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "from the beginning, ancient." It is from this word that we derive the English word archaic. The phrase *mongrelize or corrupt the seedline* is translated for the Greek word μοιχεύσεισ (moicheuseis), the second person singular, future indicative of μοιχεύω (moicheuo), one of the four base derivative of μοιχός (moichos), our subject word. We have translated μοιχός (moichos) this way in this passage because truly, as we said when defining the word, both concepts came to the mind of the hearer when they heard the word μοιχός (moichos) until and unless there was further qualification as to exactly which concept was being referred. We see that this qualification is given in the next lines, and it is for this reason that we have translated ἐμοίχευσεν (emoicheusen) as *corrupted his seedline.* Ἐμοίχευσεν (emoicheusen), is the active verbal form of μοιχεύω (moicheuo), one of the four base derivative of μοιχός (moichos), our subject word.

For those studying the codified law of God, they will find that lustful behavior was prohibited among the Adamic race by other laws that regulated life and marriage. The particular prohibition that Christ magnified was the statement that

prohibited a white man from even thinking about sexual intercourse with a non-white. Christ pronounced such unholy thoughts as sin, and John characterized this mental behavior as **"the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the bragging of life"** (I John 2:16 AST). The subject is admiration of mongrels, and its purpose was to call profound attention to the causative factors of social destruction. Christ can only be understood when it is comprehended that His glorious message was first and foremost a racial message echoed throughout the world by the Greek speaking Israelites, and that He emphatically declared that He had not come but unto the lost sheep of the House of Israel (Matthew 10:6), who at the time of these statements were in truth not a lost people at all. Israelite Hebrewism was well represented in colonies throughout the Hellenistic world, centrally represented at Alexandria, Egypt, where history records that there were well over one million Israelites, with a functioning temple. The Alexandrian Israelites had for over three hundred years prior to Christ represented true Israelite thought as may be seen in the writings of Philo of Alexandria. For Christ to take the position that to lust after a mongrel was sin was by no means a new innovation in Israelite theology.

We look next at Matthew 15:19 which reads in the King James Version:

> **"For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies."**

Let us now examine the more accurate translation of the AST:

> **"For from the heart come forth evil thoughts: murders, mongrelization, whoredom, thefts, lyings, blasphemies."**

Murders is translated for φόνοι (phonoi) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "murder, homicide, slaughter."

Mongrelization is translated for the Greek word μοιχείαι (moicheiai), nominative plural of μοιχεία (moicheia), one of the four base derivatives of our subject word μοιχός (moichos). *Whoredom* is translated for πορνείαι (porneiai), nominative plural of πορνεία (porneia) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "fornication, prostitution." *Thefts* is translated for the Greek word κλοπαί (klopai), nominative plural of κλοπή (klope) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "theft." *Lyings* is translated for the Greek word ψευδομαρτυρίαι (pseudomarturiai), nominative plural of ψευδομαρτυρέω (pseudomartureo) and is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to bear a false witness, bear false witness," and is always in reference to the crossing over or trespassing of the ninth codified law of God. *Blasphemies* is translated for the Greek word βλασφημίαι (blasphemiai), nominative plural of βλασφημία (blasphemia) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "defamatory, calumnious, abusive language, blasphemy against one," but which in Israelite usage was always in reference to the act of opposition against the teachings of the One, True God. In modern terms, it was the act of men who call God a liar, and promote practices contrary to the stated will of Almighty God.

We look next at Matthew 19:18 which reads in the King James Version:

"He saith unto him, Which? Jesus said thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness."

Let us look now at a the AST:

"He said to Him, 'Which?' And Jesus said: 'You will not murder; you will not mongrelize; you will not steal; you will not bear false witness.'"

The King James Version translation of this verse is fairly accurate with a true understanding of the meaning of *adultery*. The word *mongrelize* is translated for the Greek word

μοιχεύσεισ (moicheuseis), the second person singular, future indicative of μοιχεύω (moicheuo), one of the four base derivative of μοιχός (moichos), our subject word. It is important to note that when Christ was approached by a wealthy young Israelite and asked what he must do to inherit or receive eternal life, Christ immediately summarized those points of the divine law that have to do with Adamic man's duty to other Adamic men, and in this divine summarization we note that the Savior specifically and most emphatically states, *You will not mongrelize.* There can be no question that the primary intent of the Christ's use of the word μοιχός (moichos) was one of racial consciousness. Wherein the aspect of violation of a fellow Israelite's seedline is concerned, Christ chose to summarize that violation of divine law with the phrase *Love thy neighbor as thyself;* for the obedient Israelite, fulfilling this divine command, would certainly not violate his racial neighbor's seedline. Christ often summarized this point of the divine law with the phrase *"Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."*

We look next at Mark 7:21 which reads in the King James Version:

"For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders..."

Let us look now at the Anointed Standard Translation:

"For from within, out of the heart of men, the thoughts of evil pass out: whoredeom, thefts, murders, mongrelization ..."

Besides minor contextual discrepancies, the King James Version translation of this text is without great fault when we understand the meaning of the English words employed by the translators at the time. *Mongrelization* is translated for the Greek word μοιχείαι (moicheiai), the nominative plural of μοιχεία (moicheia), one of the four base derivatives of our subject word μοιχός (moichos).

The word *whoredom* is translated for the Greek word πορνειαι (porneiai), the nominative plural of πορνεία (porneia) which is defined be Liddell and Scott as: "fornication, to prostitute, debauch, prostitution." As we said earlier, the meaning of *whoredom* or *prostitution* does not come as a great surprise when we understand what the word fornication meant in 1611. Our understanding of this word has become clouded through time because of its perversion by theologians.

Webster's Third New International Dictionary defines fornication as: "human sexual intercourse other than between a man and his wife, sexual intercourse between a spouse and an unmarried person, sexual intercourse between unmarried people." As we see, fornication entails several facets of illicit sexual activity and seems to be most often used for what theologians call *adultery*, that is, *sexual intercourse between a married person and another person whether married or not.* However, the concept of *prostitution* or *whoredom* plays a key role in the defining of this word when we investigate its etymology.

Fornication is taken from the Latin word *fornicatus* which means according to Cassell's: "arched, vaulted." *Fornicatus* is derived from the Latin word *fornix* which is defined by *Cassell's Latin Dictionary* as: "an arch, vault, Liv. Transf. a brothel." Indeed, we find that there is an English word *fornix* that carries this similar meaning and is also found in one of the definitions of *fornication*. The connection of the concept of an arch or a vault with that of prostitution lies in the definition given *fornix* where it says, "Liv. Transf. a brothel." This means that Livy, a historian who lived between 59 BC and AD 17 transferred or used in an altered or metaphorical sense the word *fornix* for *a brothel*. The reason for this is that Livy was describing a common characteristic of a brothel, that being a vault.

Others followed Livy's lead in the use of the word in this way, and eventually it became common enough that the King James Version translators felt comfortable in their choice of *fornication* to express *prostitution*.

While there are no Latin derivatives of πορνεία (porneia), there are several English derivatives including *pornocracy*, a government run by whores, and *pornography*, a visual depiction or description of prostitutes or prostitution and erotic behavior.

The fact that πορνεία (porneia) or *prostitute* or *whore* follows μοιχός (moichos) in this passage emphatically demands that μοιχός (moichos) be interpreted as a prohibition of race-mixing. Throughout the New Testament, whenever πορνεία (porneia) or πόρνος (pornos) is used, it is always in reference to female or male *whoredom* or *catamites*. Etymologically speaking, there can be no true understanding of the occurrences of these words without a historical understanding of the false love religions that emanated from Babylon and continually assaulted the true Adamic religion of the Israelites by sending mongrelized prostitutes, both male and female, into the society of the Israelites. The old love religions of Babylon specifically demanded sexual activity as a votive act. This was calculated to destroy the moral and racial consciousness of the Adamic Israelites.

We look next at Mark 10:11-12 which reads in the King James Version:

"And he saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, commiteth adultery against her. And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she commiteth adultery."

Let us now look at the superior translation of the AST:

"And He said to them, 'Whoever may dismiss his woman and marry another is in seedline corruption with her, and if a woman may dismiss her man and marries another, she corrupts the seedline.'"

In this instance, it is unclear whether these matters take place within the race or are inter-racial. All evidence, however, including review of the surrounding passages, would indicate

that this verse is in reference to matters within the race. It is for this reason that the Greek word μοιχαται (moichatai) has been in both instances translated in terms of seedline corruption. Even if this scenario were to take place outside the race, it would still be supported by this translation because it would still be the corruption of the spouse's seedline. Μοιχαται (moichatai) is the third person singular, present indicative form of μοιχάομαι (moichaomai) which is the futuristic form of μοιχός (moichos). Thus the usage of this form of μοιχός (moichos) carries an all inclusive prohibition and simultaneously forbids race-mixing as well as the destruction of the patriarchal seedline.

We look next at Matthew 5:32 which reads in the King James Version:

"But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery, and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced commiteth adultery."

Let us now look at the Anointed Standard Translation:

"But I say to you, that whoever puts away his woman, except for a matter of whoredom, makes her corrupt the seedline. And whoever will marry the one put away corrupts the seedline."

Whoredom is translated for the Greek word πορνείας (porneias), the genitive singular of πορνεία (porneia) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "fornication, prostitution." The phrase corrupt the seedline is translated for the Greek word μοιχασθαι (moichasthai), the present infinitive of μοιχάομαι (moichaomai), one of the four base derivatives of our subject word μοιχός (moichos). The phrase *corrupts the seedline* is translated for the Greek word μοιχαται (moichatai), third person singular, present indicative of μοιχάομαι (moichaomai). This statement of Christian law is far more reaching than simply the prohibition of the breaking of the

marriage vow, whether to the individual Adamic or to the Adamic nation, for it includes not only prohibitions against illicit physical acts, wherein an Adamic woman or man would commit whoredom to break covenant with the Living God, but it also includes the mental or spiritual aspect that rationally precedes the physical act. The intent in this verse is to encompass not only the act itself, but the mental process of whoredom that leads to the act.

Therefore, the passage is in reference not only to adultery or mongrelization, but also to idolatry, meaning spiritual or mental infidelity, which leads to being mongrelized in mind. This would mean, according to the intent of Christ's words, that the Christian would have grounds for divorcement, not simply in the case of physical infidelity but also in the case of spiritual infidelity. The intent is to convey that those who gave themselves over to the false love religions did more than mongrelize themselves physically, but were in effect mongrelized mentally, and therefore rendered totally impure and beyond redemption or suitability for re-entrance to Aryan society.

Thus, Christ declared that whoever would marry such a person was guilty of corrupting not only his personal seedline, but also the national seedline of Israel. Therefore, the purpose of the statement was to emphasize the sanctity of holy marriage, and for the sake of marriage and the preservation of race, to promote a benevolent tolerance between married people, while at the same time declaring and drawing the line of absolute intolerance. It is therefore important to note that Christ clearly divided Adamic Christianity from the mongrelized love religions.

We look next at Matthew 19:9 which reads in the King James Version:

"And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, commiteth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery."

Let us now examine the AST:

"And I say to you, that whoever puts away his woman, if not for whoredom, and marries another, corrupts the seedline."

The phrase *corrupts the seedline* is translated for μοιχαται (moichatai) (See Matthew 5:32 above). *Whoredom* is translated for the Greek word πορνεία (porneia) (See Matthew 5:32 above). The second part of this verse is not in the Anointed Standard Translation. When we look at the earliest manuscripts, the second half of the verse is either absent or present in a variety of forms. It does not show up consistently until much later in the manuscript witnesses. If the passage were present, it would read: "and he who married a woman put away corrupts the seedline." However, given the nature of the manuscript evidence, it is certain that the passage was filled out to the longer form when scribes remembered Matthew 5:32.

We look next at Luke 16:18 which reads in the King James Version:

"Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, commiteth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband commiteth adultery."

Let us now look at the more accurate translation of the AST:

"Everyone putting away his woman and marrying another corrupts the seedline, and everyone marrying her having been put away from a man corrupts the seedline."

Here, just as in Mark 10:11-12 and Matthew 5:32 above, we have a case where it may be and may not be within the race. Therefore, we have rendered both occurrences of μοιχεύει (moicheuei) in this verse as corrupts the seedline. Μοιχεύει

(moicheuei) is the third person singular, present indicative of μοιχεύω (moicheo), one of the four base derivatives of μοιχός (moichos) our subject word.

We look next at Luke 18:11 which reads in the King James Version:

"The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself, God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as the publican."

Now the Anointed Standard Translation:

"The Pharisee stood praying these things to himself, 'God, I thank you that I am not as the rest of men, robbers and rapers, unjust, mongrelizers, or even this tax-collector.'"

Robbers and rapers is translated for the Greek word ἅρπαγες (arpages), the nominative plural of ἁρπαγή (arpage) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "seizure, robbery, rape." If this word was used in describing a person, it meant that they were both a raper and a robber. *Mongrelizers* is translated for μοιχοί (moichoi), nominative plural of our subject word μοιχός (moichos). Tax-collector is translated for the Greek word τελώνης (telones) which is in the nominative singular case and is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "one who farms the tolls, customs or taxes of the state, a tax-gatherer." Actually the King James Version's use of the word *publican* would be quite appropriate if the true definition of the word was more widely known. As defined by *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*, it is a "Jewish tax collector for the ancient Romans, any collector of taxes or tributes." We can look to older uses of the word to see that this was commonly accepted as the definition of publican, such as this quote from F.W. Robertson: "Publicans were outcasts among the Jews, because, having accepted the office of the Roman government . . . they were regarded as traitors."

We do well to remember as we analyze the context that the

verse under consideration is a quote of a self-righteous, hypocritical Pharisee, who on one hand declared himself righteous, while in daily life he capitulated to the enemy of the race and more often than not voted to sell out his race. In effect, he was saying one thing and doing another. Many at the time of Christ in the Pharisaical party were still Adamic and continued to work for the preservation of the racial purity of the priesthood. Yet, the party in general had, through the centuries, capitulated to the Edomite Herods and were, at the time of Christ, fundamentally controlled by the Edomite party. Christ's charge against the Pharisees is not what they said, but rather what they did. We therefore take special note that the Pharisee in question was emphatically racially conscious. Thus, Christ could say of the Pharisee, that unless one's justice should exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees, that that one will not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. Later, Jacob (James) would draw attention to the Christian prohibition against hypocrisy by describing the true faith or persuasion,

> **"But the wisdom from above is first truly pure, and is then peacable, forbearing, accommodating, full of compassion and of good fruits, not partial and not pretended"** (Jacob 3:17 AST).

The next occurrences of *adultery* that we come to in the King James Version New Testament are in John 8:3-4. This is what people commonly call the story of the 'Woman Taken in Adultery,' contained in John 7:53-8:11, which reads in the King James Version:

> **"And every man went unto his own house. Jesus went unto the mount of Olives. And early in the morning he came again into the temple, and all the people came unto him: and he lay down, and taught them. And the scribes and Pharisees brought unto him a woman taken in adultery; and when they had set her in the midst, They say unto him, Master, this woman was taken in adultery, in the very act. Now Moses in the law commanded us,**

that such should be stoned: but what sayest thou? This they said, tempting him, that they might have to accuse him. But Jesus stooped down, and with his finger wrote on the ground, as though he heard them not. So when they continued asking him, he lifted up himself, and said unto them, He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her. And again he stooped down, and wrote on the ground. And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, even unto the last: and Jesus was left alone, and the woman standing in the midst. When Jesus had lifted up himself, and saw none but the woman, he said unto her, Woman, where are those thine accusers? hath no man condemned thee? She said, No man, Lord. And Jesus said unto her, Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more."

According to this passage, Jesus was a lawbreaker and violated Leviticus 20:10, which says that an adulterer or mongrelizer shall be put to death. Even the Pharisees point out that Moses said that the woman should have been stoned. Today, Judeo preachers use the passage to argue that one cannot hold people accountable to the Laws of God because even Jesus ignored them. They further argue that even if *adultery* does mean *mongrelization*, then this passage shows that Jesus forgave it. The problem with this logic is that the *entire passage* quoted above is *not* in the Bible. Therefore, let us look at Appendix 4 of the Anointed Standard Translation:

> John 7:53—8:11 is omitted from the Anointed Standard Translation. This note presents the reasons for the omission. Aland (The Text of the NT, p. 227) comments, "However early the tradition of the pericope of the Woman Taken in Adultery may be, it is certain that these verses did not form a part of the original text of the Gospel of John when it was first circulated in the Church." Scholars are in agreement with Aland as to this passage's spuriousness. Goodspeed totally omitted it, as well as several other modern translations, and the RSV and the

NIV bracket the text and greatly question it. But it is clear that the entire passage is fraudulent for the following reasons.

The oldest Greek manuscript of the New Testament, the Vatican (Codex B, 4th cent. A.D.), does not contain this part of John. Instead, the text from 7:52 flows directly into the text of 8:12. The same is true of the Sinaitic (Codex ℵ, 5th cent. A.D.), the second oldest Greek manuscript of the NT. The third oldest is the Alexandrian (Codex A) which is defective here (it may be speculated that this defect is the result of willful and conspiratorial action at an early date). After this in age, we have the Ephraem (Codex C), which, curiously, is also defective here. As to whether A and C may or may not have originally contained what is referred to as the Pericope of the Adulteress, Metzger (A Textual Commentary of the Greek NT, p. 220) comments, "It is highly probable that neither contained the pericope, for careful measurement discloses that there would not have been space enough on the missing leaves to include the section along with the rest of the text."

Along with the witness of these four oldest and most relied upon texts are dozens of fragmentary texts dating to the same time or before these texts, including $\mathfrak{P}^{66,75}$ L N T W X Y Δ Θ Ψ 0141 0211 22 33 124 157 209 788 828 1230 1241 1242 1253 2193. The text is also absent from the oldest Syriac versions ($syr^{c,s}$ and syr^{p}). It is absent from the oldest Bohairic, Armenian, Sahidic, Peshittic, and Old Georgian manuscripts. It is absent from the Gothic versions and the best manuscripts of the Old Latin ($it^{a, 1*,q}$). No Greek Patristic Fathers comment on the passage prior to the twelfth century Euthymius Zigabenus, who mentions it only to state that it is spurious. (It is noted that some Judeo scholars insist that it was quoted by Papias, as witnessed by Eusebius. This is dealt with later on. The view presented here of its earliest patristic mention is that shared by all current scholars, exemplified by Aland, Metzger, Nestle, etc.)

The first text to contain this passage in John is Codex Bezæ. Codex Bezæ is rarely relied upon by Biblical scholars. It is used only as an early example of the development of the so-called "Western texts." The Bezæ text was discovered in 1562 by Theodore Bezæ, a close

friend of John Calvin (Cauvin). He found it at a monastery in Lyons and gave it to the Cambridge University Library in 1581. It at best can be described as a botch job. It contains Latin and Greek parallel, and often, the two texts do not agree with one another. It shows evidence of great parts of the early text being scraped off and then a new text being written in. Paterson Smyth comments, "...the most curious thing [about Bezæ] is the daring interpolations in the text, most of which are entirely unsupported by other manuscripts. Most of them are probably worthless..."

The explanation for these many fraudulent interpolations can be traced back to the fact that Bezæ represents the so-called "Western texts." This is in contrast to what are referred to as the "Neutral texts," which include the Vaticanus, Alexandrian, Sinaitic, and Ephraem. These neutral texts are said to represent the purest form of transmission of the original autographs. They are termed neutral because they show the least amount of early tampering of any of our ancient manuscripts, and it must be remembered that none of these four contain this passage in John.

The "Western texts," however, are the result of the tampering and modification of texts in ancient times. This preceded and paralleled the translation of the New Testament into Latin, both before Jerome and including Jerome. These forerunners of the Catholic Church, the "Western Church," or the Church of Rome, as opposed to the "Eastern Orthodoxy," are the ones that took it upon themselves to be the first corrupters of the New Testament.[26]

The insertion of this passage into John must have been completed sometime in the late 3rd century or early 4th century. We know this for several reasons. First, early Latin manuscripts that predate Jerome (347-420) have been found containing this (while others have been found that do not). All of these early Latin manuscripts are of course taken from "Western texts" of the Greek New Testament, the same texts

---

[26] See the Anointed Standard Translation of the New Testament, Appendices 5 and 6.

that are the ancestors of Bezæ. Therefore, they cannot be weighed above early Greek manuscripts belonging to the neutral texts that do not contain the passage. However, the existence of these Latin manuscripts dating before Jerome are dependent upon Jerome himself. He is the earliest person known to quote from or mention this passage in John, but he is not considered a Patristic Greek Father. He comments that early Latin and Greek codices, which he based the Vulgate on, contained the passage, and of course, it is contained in the Vulgate.

Some men who purport to be "learned" have cited as proof that this passage in John does not rest upon Jerome's shoulders the evidence of Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea (315-320). Typifying these Judeo so-called scholars are the compilers of the Companion Bible, which supports this position. These so-called scholars say that Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History 3:39, makes reference to an even earlier writer named Papias (a Greek Patristic Father) who supposedly quoted from this passage in John. Since Papias lived considerably earlier than Jerome, this would remove all possible blame from Jerome. However, the texts of Papias that are reported to contain this passage or quotes of it do not themselves exist, and when we examine the writings of Eusebius cited, we find that, (1) there is no reference to John or the writings of John, and that, (2) there is no reference to a woman being brought before Jesus accused of adultery or μοιχος. There is only a single, vague sentence which does not give even a hint of proof that Eusebius or Papias, either one, referenced this event in John. It could have been in reference to any number of other things. If there had been specific mention of John, his gospel, or of adultery, then this account could be considered to be of some weight, but none of these things exist. It is for this reason that the vast majority of scholars do not accept this as evidence. It is only those Judeos who are desperate to give credence to this passage that attempt to use Eusebius as proof, without examining all of the evidence.

Therefore, the burden of proof for the existence of John 7:53—8:11 rests solely and completely upon Jerome. Let us

consider Jerome's life for a moment. He was, in his young age, taught by Jewish rabbis, as is well-documented. Largely due to the influence of these rabbis on his theology, he was admittedly opposed to the Greek Septuagint (although he early on favored it) and the work of Origen, both of which are typical Jewish positions. He was a mainstream Catholic in theology, and at that time, the Roman Catholic or Universal Church was greatly corrupted, which had necessitated the separation of the Eastern Orthodox Church. Jerome's Vulgate is one of the greatest corruptions ever put forth against the Scriptures, both Old and New Testaments.

Jerome was also the first to insert I John 5:7-8 in reference to the "trinity" into the New Testament. The words do not exist in copies (of the Greek) before the 16th century and were suggested by notes on earlier Latin texts, i.e., Jerome's Latin texts (See Appendix 5). The corruptions of Jerome go on seemingly forever. His work can be given little value at all, and since he is the only witness to this passage in John 7:53—8:11, and since every reliable Greek uncial manuscript that we have contradicts him, it can be concluded that he either wrote the passage himself or willingly and blindly accepted it as accurate from earlier corrupted Latin manuscripts he may have had, probably at the suggestion of one of his many Jewish tutors.

So, why would Jerome go to such great lengths to insert this passage? The reason is quite simple, and it was certainly obvious to both Jerome and his Jewish teachers. In the passage, Jesus supposedly forgives a woman who had been taken in "adultery," from the Greek μοιχος, which means *mongrelization*. This would give the Roman Catholic Church precedence for doing the same. However, the Old Testament states that a person taken in μοιχος is to be put to death (stoned). This passage quotes Jesus as contradicting clear and explicit statements in the Old Testament Septuagint. This forced a problem on translators and lexicographers and eventually μοιχος was redefined, largely due to the Catholic Church, to be in reference to illicit carnal relations between couples where at least one of them was married. That

particular sin is covered in the tenth commandment, and now, the Catholics wanted it covered in the sixth commandment as well. Of course, in the process, they covered up the clear and explicit injunctions in both the New and Old Testaments against mongrelization.

In addition to the evidence of the manuscripts, there is the information gained from an analysis of the text itself. It breaks the continuity of John 7:52 and 8:12 and it contains many words and phrases that are used nowhere else in John.

Thus, from internal evidence alone, meaning the fact that John 7:53—8:11 contradicts other Scriptures, this passage is shown to be spurious. More than this, we have the evidence of every ancient uncial manuscript that is considered to have even the least amount of credibility. Past this, we can point to the Catholic Church and to the Jew-influenced Jerome as being personally responsible for its introduction into our texts. It should also be noted that at the time of the translation of the King James Version, the translators had only eight texts, all dating from the 10th century A.D. Since one of these texts was Bezæ and most of the others were related to the same "Western" family as Bezæ, the translators had no evidence suggesting that this passage in John was spurious. Since that time, we have found texts that number in the thousands and that date back more than 800 years before those of the KJV translators, and we can scientifically establish this passage to be fabricated. English translations since the KJV, however, have felt indebted to follow the KJV translators' example in including the passage because of the false-respect that the King James Version commands, promoted by the Judeo school of theology. However, mainstream Biblical scholars are in general agreement on the fact that the King James Version contains over 20,000 errors, and we would be willing to suggest a few hundred more. The King James Version was hated by its early reviewers, but over the years, the fact that it was "Authorized" (by a notoriously homosexual king), has somehow given it credence, and many who are led by Jew fables even believe it to be somehow "inspired."

We look next at Romans 7:3 which reads in the King James

Version:

> **"So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man."**

Let us now look at the more accurate Anointed Standard Translation of this passage:

> **"So, then, if the man is living, she will be called a seedline corrupter if she becomes another man's. But if the man dies, she is free from the law, so as for her not to be a seedline corrupter by becoming another man's."**

In this instance, contextual analysis is conclusive in indicating that everything in this verse is within the race. It should be noted that in the last phrase of the verse, no mention of marriage occurs in the Greek and was placed in the King James Version only as a logical conclusion by the translators. We, however, have attempted to remain as literal as possible to the text, and it is for this reason that none of our translations contain such spurious supposition that may possibly leave a false impression or interpretation in the mind of the reader. It is also for this reason that we have refused to translate ἀνήρ (aner) and its various forms, two of which appear in this passage (ἀνδρί [andri] and ἀνήρ [aner]), as *husband* when the words simply carry the meaning of *a man*, usually of full grown stature.

The first occurrence of *seedline corrupter* is translated for the Greek word μοιχαλίς (moichalis) which is one of the four base derivatives of our subject word μοιχός (moichos). The second occurrence of *seedline corrupter* is translated for the Greek word μοιχαλίδα (moichalida) which is the accusative singular of μοιχαλίς (moichalis), one of the four base derivatives of our subject word μοιχός (moichos). Other than these few discrepancies, the King James Version is in this case fairly

accurate, excepting the archaic language employed.

While it has been our duty to point out the discrepancies in the translation from the Greek to the English, our purpose is not to repudiate the King James Version rendition or the rational conclusions arrived at by the King James Version translators, since we agree that it is quite legitimate to insert the English concept of husband and marriage. Our argument is rather that the term *seedline corrupter* should have been employed, because it requires no deductive reasoning as it is a literal translation.

We look next at I Corinthians 6:9 which reads in the King James Version:

"Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind,"

And now the AST:

"Or do you not know that the unjust ones will not inherit the government of God? Do not be led astray, neither prostitutes, nor idolaters, nor mongrelizers, nor effeminates, nor homosexuals..."

The King James Version Translators would have done well to leave this verse alone. The glossing over of the word *homosexuals* in the King James Version is curious. The fact that the Greek word ἀρσενοκοῖται (arsenokoitai) means *homosexual* is by no means a subject of debate, for we find that even the three most liberal translations, The Living Bible, The Modern Language Bible, and the New International Version, translated this word correctly, as *homosexual*, as do the conservative translations, such as J.P. Green's. If we look at the Greek word ἀρσενοκοῖται (arsenokoitai), we find that it is composed of two words, ἄρσεν (arsen) and κοῖτος (koitos). Ἄρσεν (arsen) means male or of the male sex and κοῖτος (koitos) is where we get the English word *coitus* and it is

usually indicative of sexual intercourse between a man and a woman, but here we see that when the it is combined with ἄρσεν (arsen) the two words literally mean sex among men, and is specifically in reference to *sodomites*, even more specific than *homosexual*, which literally means *sex among the same*.

Why then was this and other instances, such as the occurrence in I Timothy 1:10, not translated correctly in the King James Version? The most logical explanation is that this is proof of what has been long suspected by historians, that King James was himself a homosexual. Many men have been suspected of being his lovers, including: Robert Carr, George Villiers, Robert Cecil, Esmé Stuart, and even his tutors, George Buchanan and Peter Young. Otto Scott, in his biography *James I: The Fool As King*, connects King James to more than one of these men. After his relationship with Esmé Stuart had concluded, King James turned to Carr, and Scott writes:

> Meanwhile, he enjoyed his court, and Carr. His new favorite was perfect for him in every way—including a capacity for bisexuality. James liked men who liked women; he was not jealous of their heterosexual affairs. On the contrary, he enjoyed hearing details; they seemed to help convince him of women's inferiority.

Later, he turned to Villiers, and Francis Osborne wrote:

> ... the love the King showed was as amorously conveyed as if he had mistaken their sex and thought them ladies, which I have seen Somerset and [Villiers] labour to resemble, in the effeminateness of their dressings, though in whoreson lookes and wanton gestures, they exceeded any part of womankind my conversation did every cope withall. Nor was his love, or what else posterity will please to call it ... carried on with a discretion sufficient to cover a lesse scandalous behavior; for the kings kissing them after so lacivious a mode in publick, and upon the theatre, as it were, of the world, prompted many to imagine some things done in the tying-

house [bedroom] that exceed my expressions...[27]

The King did not limit himself to his lovers, either. Once he kissed Sir Henry Rich on the lips before the entire court. Rich turned away and spat on the ground, overcome with disgust. No, it was no secret that King James was a homosexual in his own day, but today many do not seem to want to admit it.

Even simple exposés into his life are littered with quotes like the one from the *Encyclopedia Britannica* which says:

> Throughout his life, however, James exhibited little interest in the opposite sex. It seems that he never had a mistress [virtually unknown among English Kings] and was interested in women only as wives and mothers of his male friends.

James was well known as an effeminate and was given the common nickname of Queen James.[28] In more modern times, the homosexuals have become quite proud to name "Queen" James as belonging to their ranks: the national faggot magazine *Advocate* has listed King James as one of their sixty-seven renowned and famous homosexuals and bisexuals.[29]

Thus, it would seem apparent that the absence of the word homosexual from the King James translation was due to the influence exerted by the King and other prominent homosexuals in the Church and other positions of authority on the translators, through the appointment of Richard Bancroft by the King. Richard Bancroft was used as his instrument by being placed in charge of drafting the regulations that

---

[27] Robert Ashton, ed., James I by His Contemporaries, p. 114.

[28] Geddes MacGregor in his book A Literary History of the Bible, on page 172, says of "Queen" James: "James had all a woman's vanity ... James, however, seemed to them a pedantic Scot with the mentality of a French harlot. No wonder it was whispered that King Elizabeth had been succeeded by Queen James."

[29] The Book of Lists, Volume 1, by Irving Wallace.

governed and guidelined the translators. It is small wonder that other paramount truths were also hidden.

Thus, the word *homosexuals* is translated for the Greek word ἀρσενοκοῖται (arsenokoitai), nominative plural of ἀρσενοκοίτης (arsenokoites). The word *prostitutes* is translated for the Greek word πόρνοι (pornoi), nominative plural of πόρνος (pornos) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a fornicator, a catamite." *Mongrelizers* is translated for the Greek word μοιχοί (moichoi), nominative plural of μοιχός (moichos), our subject word. *Effeminates* is translated for the Greek word μαλακοὶ (malakoi) nominative plural of μαλακός (malakos) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "soft, effeminate, easy, careless, remiss," and is actually in reference to men who are easily manipulated by women.

We look next at Galatians 5:19 which reads in the King James Version:

> **"Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness,"**

Let us look now at the AST:

> **"Now the actions of the flesh are clearly revealed, which are: [mongrelization], whoredom, impurity, raping..."**

Clearly revealed is translated for the Greek word φανερὰ (phanera), from φανερός (phaneros), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "open to sight, visible, evident, manifest, plainly, clearly, known, famous." *Mongrelization* is translated for the Greek word μοιχεία (moicheia), one of the four base derivatives of our subject word. The word *whoredom* is translated for the Greek word πορνεία (porneia) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as "fornication, to prostitute, debauch, prostitution." *Impurity* is translated for the Greek word ἀκαθαρσία (akatharsia) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "uncleanness." Ἀκαθαρσία (akatharsia) is a

derivative of ἀκάθαρτος (akathartos) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "uncleaned, impure, unclean, unpurified." The word raping is translated for the Greek word ἀσέλγεια (aselgeia) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "intemperate, extravagant, excess in lusts and desires, lewd, to treat with brutal insolence or violence." It is implied by this word that the method used to fulfill excessive lusts and desires is through brutal insolence or violence, reminding us of rape in modern terms.

While a true translation of this verse is certainly self-explanatory, still the truth-loving student should be reminded that Paul's list of the works of the flesh was in truth a list of Christian prohibitions, and we need hardly remind the Christian reader that those who commit such things will not inherit the Government of God.

We look next at Jacob (James) 4:3-4 which reads in the King James Version:

> **"Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts. Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God."**

Let us now look at the Anointed Standard Translation:

> **"You ask, and do not receive, because you ask wrongly, in order that you may spend on your lusts. Oh female mongrelizers! Do you not know that the love of the world is enmity with God? Whoever then purposes to be a lover of the world is established to be an enemy of God."**

The words *Oh female mongrelizers* are translated for μοιχαλίδες (moichalides), the vocative plural of μοιχαλίς (moichalis), the feminine of μοιχός (moichos) our subject word. The word *female* is inserted to emphasize the femininity of the word, as other forms such as mongrelizeresses are not

preferred. *Oh* is used because the words are in the vocative case showing direct address. Note that the word μοιχοί (moichoi), translated by the King James Version as *adulterers*, is not in the Anointed Standard Translation. This word was added by copyists who did not understand what was meant by *female mongrelizers* and added the masculine form, assuming Jacob was in reference to the people he was writing to, male and female both, not the women only. However, Jacob addressed this book to the twelve tribes of Israel and he is addressing them figuratively because the Nation of Israel, in the feminine, was referred to figuratively in this way (Psalms 5:27; Isaiah 54:5; Jeremiah 3:20; Ezekiel 16:23; Hosea 9:1). Thus, the masculine form of the word does not appear in any manuscripts until the 5th century.

Lover and *love* are translated for forms of φιλία (philia) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "love, lover."

The words *lover of the world* bring forth the connotation of persons who displayed a distinct preference for the philosophical and religious system exemplified by the degenerate Babylonian society. The concept is indicative of Romantic, metropolitan philosophy, or what in modern times is exemplified by the Jewish Babylonian Talmudic school of rabbinical philosophy and is set forth even more clearly in the secular tenets of modern Humanism. For this reason, Paul argued that the Christians, while physically in the world, were not of the prevailing philosophy of the world.

We look next at II Peter 2:14 which reads in the King James Version:

"Having eyes full of adultery, and that cannot cease from sin; beguiling unstable souls: an heart they have exercised with covetous practices; cursed children."

Let us now examine the AST:

"Having eyes full of mongrelization and never ceasing from failure, seducing unsettled lives; having a heart having been exercised in greediness, cursed

children."

Mongrelization is translated for the Greek word μοιχαλίδος (moichalidos), the genitive singular of μοιχαλίς (moichalis), one of the four base derivatives of our subject word. *Seducing* is translated for the Greek word δελεάζοντες (deleazontes), and in this case we are modernizing the word the King James Version translators used, *beguiled*. *Unsettled* is translated for the Greek word ἀστηρίκτους (asteriktous) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "not firmly fixed, unsettled, unstable."

We have rendered the phrase καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην (kardian gegumnasmenen) as *having a heart having been exercised*, as opposed to the King James Version's *an heart they have exercised* to better relate the passive voice applied to the Greek word γεγυμνασμένην (gegumnasmenen) which is the accusative singular, feminine, participle, perfect, passive form of γυμνάζω (gumnazo). Γυμνάζω (gumnazo) simply carried the connotation of exercising in the gymnasium, training or accustoming oneself to a certain thing, and the person to whom this word was applied was almost always naked while participating in these various gymnastics.

In our translation we have literally expressed the case, number, and tense of γεγυμνασμένην (gegumnasmenen), but we have failed to connote the gender of γεγυμνασμένην (gegumnasmenen), which is feminine as opposed to the masculine form of the word, γεγυμνασμένοις (gegumnasmenois). It is unclear whether this is of great importance to the translation, but it does indicate one thing: that this and the preceding verses were speaking of women or in this case a woman. This is further verified by the fact that μοιχαλίδος (moichalidos), the genitive singular of μοιχαλίς (moichalis), translated herein as *mongrelization*, is also feminine in gender, although, once again, unexpressed in our translation. Note also that we said earlier that this passage was speaking of a woman, because both μοιχαλίδος (moichalidos) and γεγυμνασμένην (gegumnasmenen) are singular in number, genitive singular and accusative singular, respectively.

The last difference in the two translations is the Greek word πλεονεξίας (pleonexiais) translated *greediness* in the AST and *covetous practices* in the King James Version. Πλεονεξίας (pleonexiais) is the dative plural of πλεονεξία (pleonexia), thus being the indirect object of the verb γεγυμνασμένην (gegumnasmenen), and for this reason we have added the word *in* immediately before *greediness* in our translation. Πλεονεξία (pleonexia) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a disposition to take more than one's share, a grasping temper, greediness, covetousness, a claiming of more than one's share," but in the translation under consideration it also carries the connotation of *dissatisfaction with one's allotted place in creation under the divine order*, preordained by Almighty God. The person under consideration is not exclusively greedy for physical gain, but was greedy to change their allotted position. Given the literal racial imperatives of the statement and the feminine gender applied to the words, it is logical to summarize that the statement is specifically in reference to women seeking to race-mix. It is important to note that while our purpose here is to bring forth a true translation of μοιχός (moichos), it is also important to remember that the context in which the verse appears later characterizes the condition under consideration as having gone in the way of Balaam. In as much as the Christian Scriptures connect the race-mixer with the activities of Balaam at Baal-Peor, this means that the statements of the Apostle are irrefutably connected to the activities of Balaam, which are forever connected in history with capitulation to the race-mixing cult and outdoor whorehouse of Baal-Peor. For the sake of brevity, we refer the reader to the booklet, *The Racial War at Baal-Peor*, for it is certain that the historical references and statements of the Scriptures cannot be dismissed if one is to gain a true understanding of the etymological history of the words in question.

We would also point out that the Greek Septuagint is the only true link to this understanding, since the Talmudic Masoretic text did not exist until 1050 A.D.

We look next at Revelations 2:22 which reads in the King

James Version:

"Behold, I will cast her into a bed, and them that commit adultery with her into great tribulation, except they repent of their deeds."

And now the AST:

"Behold, I am throwing her into a bed, and those mongrelizing with her into great affliction – unless they repent of her works."

I am throwing is translated for the Greek word βάλλω (ballo), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to throw, cast, hurl at." It is translated herein in the present tense as opposed to the future tense as in the King James Version. The futuristic version of the word is βαλῶ (balo); whether this mistake on the part of the King James Version translators was deliberate or just a misreading is uncertain; what is certain is that it should correctly be rendered in the present tense. *Mongrelizing* is translated for the Greek word μοιχεύοντας (moicheuontas), the accusative plural, masculine, participle, present of μοιχεύω (moicheuo), one of the four base derivative of μοιχός (moichos) our subject word. In our translation we have rendered it *those mongrelizing,* which is much more definite than the KJV in conveying the fact that μοιχεύοντας (moicheuontas) is in the active voice, because this word's root μοιχεύω (moicheuo) is an active form of our subject word μοιχός (moichos).

Affliction is translated for the Greek word θλῖψιν (thlipsin) the accusative singular of θλῖψις (thlipsis) which is defined by *The Analytical Greek Lexicon* as: "pressure, compression, met. [metaphorically] affliction, distress, distressing circumstances, trial, affliction." Works is translated for the Greek word ἔργων (ergon), which is genitive plural of ἔργον (ergon) and is defined by the Liddell and Scott as: "work, a man's business, employment, business." This definition indicates that ἔργον (ergon) is not so much a deed or a few deeds in particular, but

rather a man's profession, his life's work, his business, or better said, an ongoing type of activity. The blatant discrepancy in the tense of βάλλω (ballo) may well be due to the fact that at the time of the King James Version translation, no Greek manuscript of the Apocalypse was said to be available. Thus, the Latin was translated back into Greek, and then the Greek into English. The truth is, most of the great codices were not discovered until after the King James Version was released. (See the introduction to the Anointed Standard Translation of the New Testament.)

Finally, it should be noted that the King James Version, following the Textus Receptus, reads *their deeds*, as opposed to *her works*. The oldest Greek manuscripts show that the pronoun was the third person singular form originally in the Greek, and not the third person plural. (For the textual evidence, see the footnote regarding this word in the Anointed Standard Translation).

We look next at Luke 18:20, which reads in the King James Version:

> **"Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Honour thy father and mother."**

Now the Anointed Standard Translation:

> **"You know the commandments, 'Mongrelize not, murder not, steal not, lie not, honor your father and mother.'"**

This verse is rather simple for the translator. First, we have the introductory phrase, then the next four phrases are merely four verbs in the second person singular, aorist first, subjunctive mood, and with each is attached a negative adverb modifier, in this case μή (me) which simply means *not* or *no*. The first is the Greek word μοιχεύσης (moicheuses) which is rooted to μοιχεύω (moicheuo), one of the four base derivatives of our subject word μοιχός (moichos) and is translated

mongrelize. Next, we have the Greek word φονεύσης (phoneuses), which is rooted to the word φόνος (phonos) and is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "murder, homicide, slaughter," and which we have translated murder. Then we have the Greek word κλέψης (klepses) which is rooted to the word κλέπτω (klepto) and is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to steal, purloin." We have translated κλέψης (klepses) as *steal*. Next, we have the Greek word ψευδομαρτυρήσης (pseudomartureses) which is rooted to the word ψευδομαρτυρέω (pseudomartureo) and is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to bear a false witness, bear false witness." We have translated this word *lie*.

As we said earlier, all of these verbs are in the form of the second person singular, aorist first, subjunctive mood. The second person would be *you* or *thou* and is understood. The subjunctive mood is the potential mood meaning that the things being stated belong to the realm of probability and are conceivable, but have not yet happened and are not happening and may not happen as would be the case with the indicative mood or the mood of certainty. Finally, the aorist first or the constative aorist is contemplative and regards an action in its entirety, gathering an event into a single whole regardless of duration; thus, the writer is speaking of the acts described in the passage in whole, not limiting them to merely the outcome or the initiation or even the committing of the act itself, but all of these things or any of these things.

Finally, the last phrase reads *honor your father and mother* and is the same as the King James Version with the exception of the use of *your* as opposed to *thy*.

We look next at Mark 10:19, which reads in the King James Version:

> **"Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Defraud not, Honour thy father and mother."**

Let us now examine the AST:

"You know the commandments, 'Mongrelize not, murder not, steal not, lie not, defraud not, honor your father and mother.'"

This verse is almost an exact parallel to Luke 18:20, with which we just dealt. However, it does have the phrase *defraud not*, curiously absent from the parallel. In fact, many Greek manuscripts omit the phrase, but it is certain that the most ancient texts do contain the phrase and thus it is original. Futhermore, it is found in the Septuagint in Sirach 4:1. *Defraud* is translated for the Greek word ἀποστερήσῃς (apostereses) which is derived from the word ἀποστερέω (apostereo) and is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to rob, bereave, or defraud." For information on the other parts of the verse, see Luke 18:20 above.

Christ begins enumerating the commandments with the fifth commandment. He is not diminishing the importance of the preceding four, which define the Israelite's duty to God, but He is rather focusing upon those commandments concerning the Israelite's duty to his fellow Israelite and nation. The fact that He concludes with the fifth commandment, *Honor your father and mother*, and does not state the commandments in the Exodus order, calls attention to the fact that the foremost problem in Judea which Christ was emphasizing was that of race-mixing or mongrelization.

We look next at Romans 13:9 which reads in the King James Version:

"For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet, and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."

Let us now look at the AST:

"For, 'You will not mongrelize; You will not murder; You will not steal; [You will not lie;] You will not lust;'

and if there is any other commandment, it is summed up in these words, 'You will love your neighbor as yourself.'"

The first five phrases of this verse are simply a verb in the form of the second person singular, future indicative, coupled with a negative adverb modifier, in this case the Greek word οὐ (ou) which means not and is used in independent clauses, whereas μή (me), used elsewhere for these same phrases, is used in dependent clauses. The words *mongrelize*, *murder*, *steal*, and *lie* have been defined in the explanation of Luke 18:20 above, the only difference here being the ending applied to the words, which is -εἰς (-eis) indicative of the form of the second person singular, future indicative. An additional phrase is here added: *you will not lust*, which is translated for the Greek words οὐ ἐπιθυμήσεις (ou epithumeseis). The word ἐπιθυμήσεις (epithumeseis) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "lust after, desire eagerly," and connotes a mental process that ultimately results in physical behavior.

Note that the words *You will not lie* are contained in open brackets in the Anointed Standard Translation, indicating that the evidence is equally split on the inclusion or omission of the words.

We look next at Romans 2:22 which reads in the King James Version:

"Thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege?"

The Anointed Standard Translation reads:

"He saying not to mongrelize, do you mongrelize? The one detesting the idols, do you rob the temple?"

The first *mongrelize* in this verse is translated for μοιχεύειν (moicheuein), the present infinitive of μοιχεύω (moicheuo), and the second mongrelize in this verse is translated for

μοιχεύεις (moicheueis), the second person singular, present indicative of μοιχεύω (moicheuo), one of the four base derivatives of μοιχός (moichos), our subject word. The word detesting is translated for the Greek word βδελυσσόμενος (bdelussomenos), which is the nominative singular, masculine, participle present of βδελύσσομαι (bdelussomai) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to feel disgust, to detest, to have a horror of." *Do you rob the temple* is translated for the Greek word ἱεροσυλεῖς (ierosuleis) which is the second person singular, present indicative of ἱεροσυλέω (ierosuleo) and is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to rob a temple, steal sacred things."

We look next at Jacob (James) 2:11 which reads in the King James Version:

"For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law."

This passage reads in the AST:

"For He who said, 'You will not mongrelize,' also said, 'You will not murder.' But if you do not mongrelize, but commit murder, you have become a transgressor of the law."

This passage is rendered fairly well in the King James Version, comparatively speaking. The first occurrence of the word *mongrelize* is translated for the Greek word μοιχεύσης (moicheuses) which is the second person singular, aorist first, subjunctive, of μοιχεύω (moicheuo). This form of the word is discussed in the explanation of Luke 18:20. The second occurrence of the word mongrelization is translated for the Greek word μοιχεύσεισ (moicheuseis), the second person singular, future indicative of μοιχεύω (moicheuo), one of the four base derivative of μοιχός (moichos), our subject word. This form of the word is discussed in the explanation of the parallel verses of Exodus 20:13 and Deuteronomy 5:18.

The reader will also note that we have translated φόνος (phonos) as murder. Φόνος (phonos) is a prohibition against premeditated murder or homicide, specifically within the Israelite society. On the other hand, it does not prohibit the act of premeditatedly killing national enemies or the executing of capital punishment. Here the Apostle Jacob is quoting the codified law or the Ten Commandments. The principle Jacob sought to illustrate by contrasting divine admonitions is the same as stated by the Apostle Paul. If a person offends in one point of the law, then they are guilty of all. The intent of Jacob is to equate premeditated homicide with the premeditated act of race-mixing. Thus, in the Christian persuasion or belief system, race-mixing was deemed a sin unto death.

The occurrence in Wisdom 17:4 of μοιχός (moichos) is in reality not an occurrence at all, but instead a mistake in the Sixtine text; this passage is correct in the Alexandrian text with the word μοχός (mochos), omitting the iota.

We look next at Ecclesiasticus (Sirach) 25:2 which reads in Brenton's translation:

"Three sorts of men, my soul hateth, and I am greatly offended at their life, a poor man that is proud, a rich man that is a liar, and an old adulterer that doateth."

Let us now look at a more accurate translation:

"My life hates three sort of men, and I am offended much at their life: an extravagant beggar, a lying rich man, an old man who is a mongrelizer and is void of understanding."

Extravagant is translated for the Greek word ὑπερήφανος (uperephanos), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "magnificent, splendid, noble, extravagant, overweening, arrogant." *Beggar* is translated for the Greek word πτωχόν (ptochon), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a beggar." Mongrelizer is translated for μοιχὸν (moichon) a derivative of μοιχός (moichos), our subject word. The phrase

and is void of understanding is borrowed from a translation of this passage by Edgar Goodspeed. More literally however, it would be rendered *and is of diminished or of inferior conscious.* Ecclesiasticus, written by Jesus the Son of Sirach, is one of the purest Israelite writings that have come down to us, and is a true depiction of the prevailing attitudes and beliefs of the Israelites in dispersion.

We look next at Hosea 2:2 which reads in Brenton's translation:

"Plead with your mother, plead: for she is not my wife, and I am not her husband, and I will remove her fornication out of my presence, and her adultery from between her breasts."

Let us now look at a more accurate translation:

"Separate yourself from your mother, separate: for she is not my woman, and I am not her man, and I will remove her whoredom out of my presence, and her mongrelization from the middle of her breasts."

The immediate problem we find with Brenton's translation is his use of the word *plead* in place of *separate*. Exactly how he arrived at this word is a mystery that was buried with him in the grave, like so many other enigmas that riddle his work. The word *separate* is translated for the Greek word κριθῆτε (krithete), the second person plural, aorist first, subjunctive mood, passive voice from of κρίνω (krino) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to separate, divide, put apart: hence to pick out, choose, to pick out for oneself, choose, prefer, to be chosen or distinguished, to pass sentence upon, to condemn." This word is used again at the end of the first phrase, where we have *separate* the second time. The word *whoredom* is translated for the Greek word πορνείαν (porneian), the accusative singular form of πορνεία (porneia) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "fornication, prostitution." *Mongrelization* is translated for the Greek word μοιχείαν

(moicheian), accusative singular of μοιχεία (moicheia), one of the four base derivatives of our subject word μοιχός (moichos).

We look next at Hosea 3:1 which reads in Brenton's translation:

"And the Lord said to me, go yet, and love a woman that loves evil things, and an adulteress, even as the Lord loves the children of Israel, and they have respect to strange gods, and love cakes of dried grapes."

Let us now look at a superior translation:

"And my Master said to me, journey yet, and love a woman who loves evil and mongrelization, even as God loves the sons of Israel, and they have respect for gods of other races and love cakes of dried grapes."

The word *journey* is translated for the Greek word πορεύθητι (poreutheti), the second person plural, aorist first, subjunctive form of πορεύομαι (poreuomai) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "traveling, journeying." *Mongrelization* is translated for the Greek word μοιχαλίν (moichalin), the (either singular or plural) accusative form of μοιχαλίς (moichalis), one of the four base derivatives of our subject word μοιχός (moichos). The word *son* is translated for the Greek word υἱούς (huious) which Brenton has translated children and is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "son."

Other races, which Brenton has rendered *strange*, is translated for the Greek word ἀλλότριος (allotrios) which is synonymous with ἀλλογενής (allogenes), although often ἀλλότριος (allotrios) was used in the understanding that the *other race* was what we today think of as *another ethnicity*. Thus, ἀλλότριος (allotrios) might be used to denote someone of a different nation (for example, non-Israelite) but of the same race (Adamic). Ἀλλογενής (allogenes) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "of another race". Ἀλλογενής (allogenes) is a combination of ἄλλος (allos) which means *other* and γένος

(genos) which means *race*, thus ἀλλογενής (allogenes) means *of another race*. Unlike ἀλλότριος (allotrios), ἀλλογενής (allogenes) encompassed both someone of a different ethnicity or tribal identification and of another race (non-Adamic).

We look next at Hosea 7:4 which reads in Brenton's translation:

"They are all adulterers, as an oven glowing with flame for hot baking, on account of the kneading of the dough, until it is leavened."

Let us now look at a more accurate translation:

"They all are mongrelizers, like an oven glowing with flame for hot baking, because of the kneading of the dough until it is leavened."

Brenton's translation of this verse is fairly acceptable except for his rendition of our subject word. *Mongrelizers* is translated for the Greek word μοιχεύοντες (moicheuontes), the accusative plural of μοιχεύω (moicheuo), one of the four base derivatives of our subject word.

While the translation is somewhat obscure out of context, it does however serve to show the connection of *mongrelization* and *leaven*. The Apostle Paul warned that "a little leaven leavens the whole lump." With a true understanding of the Scriptures that the Apostle Paul was referencing, the New Testament declarations of avoiding leaven take on a clear and distinct prohibition against race-mixing.

It therefore becomes of paramount importance for the modern truth-seeker to identify precisely what Hebraic writings the first-century Church identified as Scripture. For without this identification there can be no etymological understanding. The Edomite Jew understood this important principle early in the first century. The civil war between the Edomite usurpers and Judean Israelites which was brewing at the time of Jesus came to its culmination in the now-named "Jewish Revolt," during which time the Edomite Jews

murdered the remaining Israelite priesthood. The civil war between the Edomites and Judeans ensured the victory of Rome, the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, and the cessation of the Israelite priesthood's bloodline. The Edomite Judean usurpers continued their crazed war with Rome, leading to their eventual expulsion from Jerusalem. For the next few hundred years, the remaining zealot Edomites continued their schools and created the Mishna, the Jerusalem Talmud and the Babylonian Talmud. The Christians refused to recognize the Edomite usurpers as having any religious authority, and the schools of new Judaism, Talmudic Zionists, went about to prejudice the world against the Septuagint. Their work is seen in the promotion of the Latin Vulgate and in their manufacturing of the Talmudic Masoretic Text. The prevailing bias and prejudice against the truth and continuity of the Septuagint and Greek New Testament that is so pervasive in Judeo Christianity is clearly an orchestration of behind the scenes Talmudic Rabbinical Judaism.

We look next at Isaiah 57:3 which reads in Brenton's translation:

"But draw ye near hither, ye lawless children, the seed of adulterers and the harlot."

Now we look at a more accurate translation:

"But bring yourself on, you lawless sons, the seed of mongrelizers and of the whore."

The words *bring* and *on* are translated for the Greek word προσαγαγετε (prosagagete), a form of προσάγω (prosago) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to bring to or upon, to supply, furnish, to put to, add, to bring to, move towards." *Sons* is translated for the Greek word υἱοὶ (huioi), the nominative and vocative plural of υἱός (huios) which is defined by Bauer as: "son." *Mongrelizers* is translated for the Greek word μοιχῶν (moichon), genitive plural of μοιχός (moichos), our subject word. *Whore* is translated for πόρνης

(pornes), the genitive singular form of πόρνη (porne) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a harlot." From this passage we learn that the seed of mongrelizers and whores is lawless, illicit, or illegal, and is clearly in reference to the authority of the codified law of God, the Ten Commandments.

We look next at Leviticus 20:10 which reads in Brenton's translation:

> **"Whatever man shall commit adultery with the wife of a man, or whoever shall commit adultery with the wife of his neighbor, let them die the death, the adulterer and the adulteress."**

Let us now look at a more accurate translation:

> **"The man that shall mongrelize with the woman of a man, or that shall pollute the seedline with the wife of his neighbor, let them die the death, the mongrelizer or seedline corrupter and the female mongrelizer or seedline corrupter."**

This verse is very unique in that it discusses both aspects of μοιχός (moichos) that we have presented. The first, and therefore the principle concern of the writer, gives a case of inter-racial seedline corruption. The second qualifies itself by the use of the word *neighbor* to indicate seedline corruption within the race. It actually calls for reasoning on the part of the reader. Remember that the first thing that came to the mind of the ancient Hellenist upon hearing the word μοιχός (moichos) was *mongrelization*. Therefore, since the first phrase is not qualified then it would be assumed that it is in reference to *mongrelization* and the woman in question is of non-white racial stock. When we read the next phrase, however, it is qualified by the word *neighbor,* which is translated for the Greek word πλησίον (plesion), the nominative singular, which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "neighbor." It was understood by this term that your *neighbor* was someone of the same racial stock and therefore the second phrase would be in

reference to seedline corruption within the race and would also reinforce the idea that the first phrase was interracial because the verse would otherwise be redundant. Finally, the verse gives a sentence of death for both types of seedline corrupters and for both parties involved.

Thus, *shall mongrelize* is translated for the Greek word μοιχεύσηται (moicheusetai), the third person, singular, aorist first, subjective form of μοιχεύω (moicheuo), one of the four base derivatives of our subject word μοιχός (moichos). The words *shall pollute the seedline* are also translated for the Greek word μοιχεύσηται (moicheusetai). The words *mongrelizer or seedline corrupter* are translated for the Greek word μοιχεύων (moicheuon), the nominative singular masculine participle of μοιχεύω (moicheuo), and the words *female mongrelizer or seedline corrupter* are translated for the Greek word μοιχευομένη (moicheuomene), the nominative, singular, feminine participle of μοιχεύω (moicheuo), one of the four base derivatives of our subject word μοιχός (moichos).

We look next at Job 24:15 which reads in Brenton's translation:

"And the eye of the adulterer has watched for the darkness, saying, Eye shall not perceive me, and he puts a covering on his face."

Let us now look at a more accurate translation:

"And the eye of the mongrelizer has watched darkness, saying, 'The eye shall not sense me, and he places a cover on his face.'"

Brenton's translation of this verse is fairly accurate. The word *mongrelizer* is translated for the Greek word μοιχοῦ (moichou), the genitive singular of μοιχός (moichos), our subject word. The statement is in reference to the action of the mongrelizer or race-mixer denying his or her visual senses as ordained by God in nature, which leads to the denial of true God consciousness, and therefore a denial of reality. Whenever

a little white child is taught to deny the obvious differences between black and white, in truth the white child is being taught to block out God-consciousness and to accept a false Satanic conception of reality.

We look next at Psalms 49:18 which reads in Brenton's translation:

"If thou sawest a thief, thou rannest along with him, and hast cast in thy lot with adulterers."

Let us now look at a more accurate translation:

"If you saw a thief, you ran with him, and have made among your company mongrelizers."

Here the word *mongrelizers* is translated for the Greek word μοιχῶν (moichon), the genitive plural of μοιχός (moichos), our subject word. It is interesting to note that mongrelizers are equated with thieves. Jesus said that the thief comes but to steal, and to kill, and to destroy.

We look next at Proverbs 6:32 which reads in Brenton's translation:

"But the adulterer through want of sense procures destruction to his soul."

Let us now look at a more accurate translation:

"The mongrelizer, however, through lack of rational thought, gains for himself destruction of his life."

The word *mongrelizer* is translated for the Greek word μοιχός (moichos), the nominative singular form, and our subject word. The phrase *lack of rational thought* is translated for the Greek words ἔνδειαν φρενῶν (endeian phrenon). Ἔνδειαν (endeian) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "want, lack of." Φρενῶν (phrenon) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "the mind, heart, understanding, reasoning."

We look next at Proverbs 18:22 which reads in Brenton's translation:

"He that has found a good wife has found favors, and has received gladness from God. He that puts away a good wife, puts away a good thing, and he that keeps an adulteress is foolish and ungodly."

Let us now look at a more accurate translation:

"He who finds a good woman finds favors, and receives cheerfulness from God. He who puts away a good woman, puts away a good thing, and he that keeps a mongrelizer or seedline corrupter is silly and ungodly."

The second sentence of this verse is not contained in the Talmudic Masoretic text. Brenton has translated the Greek word ἀγαθήν (agathen) as *a good thing*, as we have. The words *mongrelizer or seedline corrupter* are translated for the Greek word μοιχαλίδα (moichalida), the accusative singular of μοιχαλίς (moichalis), one of the four base derivatives of our subject word μοιχός (moichos). We have translated μοιχαλίδα (moichalida) here expressing both concepts because it is evident from the passage that both were implied.

We look next at Proverbs 24:55 (30:20 in the Septuagint) which reads in Brenton's translation:

"Such is the way of an adulterous woman, who having washed herself from what she has done, says she has done nothing amiss."

Let us now look at a more accurate translation:

"This is the way of a mongrelizing woman, who having washed herself from her business, says that she has done nothing wrong."

Mongrelizing is translated for the Greek word μοιχαλίδος

(moichalidos), the genitive singular of μοιχαλίς (moichalis), one of the four base derivatives of our subject word μοιχός (moichos). The word *business* is translated for the Greek word πραξη (praxe), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a doing, transaction, business affair, business."

We look next at Malachi 3:5 which reads in Brenton's translation:

"And I will draw near to you in judgment; and I will be a swift witness against the witches, and against the adulteresses, and against them that swear falsely by my name, and against them that keep back the hireling's wages, and them that oppress the widow, and afflict orphans, and that rest the judgment of the stranger, and fear not me, saith the Lord Almighty."

Let us now look at a more accurate translation:

"And I will draw near to you in judgment; and I will be a swift witness against the pharmakeia, and against the mongrelizers, and against them that lie by My name, and against them that defraud the worker of his wages, and them that oppress the widow, and afflict orphans, and that give ground to the judgment of the stranger, and fears Me not, says the Master Almighty."

The word *pharmakeia* is translated for the Greek word φαρμακοὺς (pharmakous), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "medicine, drug, remedy." For more information on this concept, please see Appendix 13 of the Anointed Standard Translation. The word *mongrelizers* is translated for the Greek word μοιχαλιδας (moichalidas), accusative plural of μοιχαλίς (moichalis), one of the four base derivatives of μοιχός (moichos), our subject word. The word *defraud* is translated for ἀποστερέω (apostereo), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "rob, bereave, or defraud."

We look next at Jeremiah 3:8 which reads in Brenton's translation:

"And I saw that (for all the sins of which she was convicted, wherein the house of Israel committed adultery, and I put her away, and gave into her hands a bill of divorcement,) yet faithless Juda feared not, but went and herself also committed fornication."

Let us now look at a more accurate translation:

"And I saw that even for all the failures of which she was convicted, wherein the house of Israel mongrelized, and I putting her away gave into her hands a bill of divorcement, yet persuasionless Juda did not fear, but went and prostituted herself also."

The word *mongrelized* is translated for the Greek word ἐμοιχατο (emoichato), a form of μοιχάομαι (moichaomai), one of the four base derivatives of our subject word. The word *prostituted* is translated for the Greek word επορνευσεν (eporneusen), a verbal form of πορνεία (porneia) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "fornication, prostitution."

We look next at Jeremiah 3:9 which reads in Brenton's translation:

"And her fornication was nothing accounted of; and she committed adultery with wood and stone."

Let us now look at a more accurate translation:

"And her whoredom was certainly not accounted of; and she mongrelized with wood and with stone."

The word *whoredom* is translated for the Greek word πορνεία (porneia) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "fornication, prostitution." The word *mongrelized* is translated for the Greek word ἐμοίχευσεν (emoicheusen), a verbal form of μοιχεία (moicheia), one of the four base derivatives of our subject word.

We look next at Jeremiah 5:7 which reads in Brenton's translation:

"In what way shall I forgive thee for these things? Thy sons have forsaken me, and sworn by them that are no gods: and I fed them to the full, and they committed adultery, and lodged in harlots' houses."

Let us now look at a more accurate translation:

"How shall I forgive you of these things? Your sons have forsaken me and swore by those who are not gods, and I fed them till they were full, and they mongrelized and stayed at houses of whores."

The word *mongrelized* is translated for the Greek word ἐμοιχωντο (emoichonto), a verbal form of μοιχός (moichos), our subject word. *Whores* is translated for the Greek word πορνῶν (pornon), genitive plural of πόρνη (porne), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a harlot, prostitute."

We look next at Jeremiah 7:9 which reads in Brenton's translation:

"And ye murder, and commit adultery, and steal, and swear falsely, and burn incense to Baal, and are gone after strange gods whom ye know not."

Let us now look at a more accurate translation:

"And you murder and mongrelize and steal and lie and burn incense to Baal and have gone after gods of other races whom you do not know."

The word *mongrelize* is translated for the Greek word μοιχασθε (moichasthe), present infinitive of μοιχάομαι (moichaomai), one of the four base derivatives of μοιχός (moichos). *Other races* is translated for the Greek word ἀλλοτρίων (allotrion), which is synonymous with ἀλλογενής

(allogenes). Ἀλλογενής (allogenes) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "of another race". We know that the words ἀλλογενής (allogenes) and ἀλλότριος (allotrios) are synonymous because they are often used interchangeably in the Septuagint, as in I Maccabees 3:36.

We look next at Jeremiah 9:2 which reads in Brenton's translation:

"Who would give me a most distant lodge in the wilderness, that I might leave my people, and depart from them? for they all commit adultery, an assembly of treacherous men."

Let us now look at a more accurate translation:

"Who will give me a distant lodge in the wilderness, so I might leave my people, and depart from them? They all mongrelize, for they are a group of treacherous men."

The word *mongrelize* is translated for the Greek word μοιχῶνται (moichontai), third person plural of μοιχός (moichos), our subject word.

We look next at Jeremiah 13:27 which reads in Brenton's translation:

"Thine adultery also, and thy neighing, and the looseness of thy fornication: on the hills and in the fields I have seen thine abominations. Woe to thee, O Jerusalem, for thou hast not been purified so as to follow me; how long yet shall it be?"

Let us now look at a more accurate translation:

"Also your mongrelization, and your snorting, and the looseness of your whoredom: on the hills and in the fields I have seen your abominations and idols. Woe to you! O Jerusalem! For you have not been purified in the manner to follow Me; how long yet shall it be?"

"Because of the iniquity which they wrought in Israel, and because they committed adultery with the wives of their fellow-citizens, and spoke a word in my name, which I did not command them to speak, and I am witness, saith the Lord."

Let us now look at a more accurate translation:

"Because of the lawlessness which they brought on in Israel, and because they corrupted the seedlines of their fellow-citizens with their wives, and spoke a word in My name, which I did not command them to speak, and I am witness, said the Master."

Lawlessness is translated for the Greek word ἀνομίαν (anomian), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "lawlessness." *Corrupted the seedlines* is translated for the Greek word ἐμοιχῶντο (emoichonto), a verbal form of μοιχός (moichos), our subject word. This verse is qualified with the words fellow-citizens and it is for this reason that we know that it is specifically in reference to the corruption of seedline within the race.

We look next at Ezekiel 16:32 which reads in Brenton's translation:

"An adulteress resembles thee, taking rewards of her husband."

Let us now look at a more accurate translation:

"You are like the woman who mongrelizes or corrupts the seedline, seizing the money of her husband."

In this verse, *woman* is actually a separate Greek word, γυνὴ (gune), and not just implied because the word μοιχωμένη (moichomene), which we have translated

mongrelizes or corrupts the seedline, is of the feminine gender. This verse is also indecisive as to whether this word is interracial or within the race, and for this reason we have translated μοιχωμένη (moichomene) expressing both concepts. The word *seizing* is translated for the Greek word λαμβάνουσα (lambanousa) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to take, take hold of, seize." *The money* is translated for the Greek word μισθώματα (misthomata) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "wages, pay, hire."

We look next at Ezekiel 16:38 which reads in Brenton's translation:

"And I will be avenged on thee with the vengeance of an adulteress, and I will bring upon thee blood of fury and jealousy."

Let us now look at a more accurate translation:

"And I will be avenged to you with the vengeance due a mongrelizer, and I will bring upon you blood of life and jealousy."

The word *mongrelizer* is translated for the Greek word μοιχαλίδος (moichalidos) genitive singular of μοιχαλίς (moichalis), one of the four base derivatives of our subject word. The word *life* is translated for θυμοῦ (thumou), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "the soul, the life, breath."

We look next at Ezekiel 23:37 which reads in Brenton's translation:

"For they have committed adultery, and blood was in their hands, they committed adultery with their devices, and they passed through the fire to them their children which they bore to Me."

Let us now look at a more accurate translation:

"For they have mongrelized, and blood was on their

hands, they mongrelized with their strategies, and their children which they bore to Me passed through the fire."

The word *mongrelized* is translated for ἐμοιχῶντο (emoichonto) in both cases, a verbal form of our subject word μοιχός (moichos). The word *strategies* is translated for the Greek word ἐνθυμήματα (enthumemata) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "thought, invention, device, stratagem." Other Greek words associated with ἐνθυμήματα (enthumemata) carry meanings dealing with the reasoning powers, and it is clear that a mental, thought-out strategy of some sort is what is meant by this word.

We look next at Ezekiel 23:43 which reads in Brenton's translation:

"Therefore I said, Do they not commit adultery with these? and has she also gone a-whoring after the manner of a harlot?"

Let us look now at a more accurate translation:

"And I said: Do not they mongrelize with such, and has she also went whoring like the manner of the prostitute?"

The words *they mongrelize* are translated for the Greek word μοιχεύουσιν (moicheuousin), the third person plural, present of μοιχεύω (moicheuo), one of the four base derivatives of our subject word μοιχός (moichos). The word *prostitute* is translated for πόρνες (pornes), the accusative singular of πόρνη (porne), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a harlot, prostitute."

XV
SRN 3435 μολύνω-moluno

Μολύνω (moluno), which is pronounced mol-oo´-no, occurs three times in the New Testament (I Corinthians 8:7; Revelation 3:4, 14:4), and does not occur in the Septuagint. We will look first at I Corinthians 8:7, which reads in the King James Version:

"Howbeit there is not in every man that knowledge: for some with conscience of the idol unto this hour eat it as a thing offered unto an idol; and their conscience being weak is defiled."

Let us now examine the AST:

"But the knowledge is not in all: for some being accustomed to the idol eat as an idolatrous sacrifice until now; and their conscience, being weak, is mongrelized."

The King James Version translation of this passage was very loose and not as literal as it certainly could have been. The words *idolatrous sacrifice* are translated for the Greek word εἰδωλόθυτον (eidolothuton), accusative singular, neuter, of εἰδωλόθυτος (eidolothutos) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "sacrificed to idols."

The word *mongrelized* is translated for the Greek word μολύνεται (molunetai), the third person singular, present indicative, passive voice form of μολύνω (moluno), our subject word. Bauer defined this word as: "stain, defile, make impure, soil." Liddell and Scott define μολύνω (moluno) as: "To stain, sully, defile, to make a beast of, to defile, debauch, of meat - to let it get roasted on the outside only." We notice in this definition such words as *to make a beast of* and *to debauch*, both of which are clearly physical, but the most interesting proof concerning this word stems from its etymology. According to Strong and other authorities, μολύνω (moluno)

is derived from the word μέλας (melas) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "black, dark, indistinct, Lat. fuscus, opp. [opposed to] λευκός [leukos], of men - black, like *hic niger est*." The Latin word *fuscus*, given in their definition as the Latin descendant, means according to Cassell: "dark colored, dark black, indistinct." The definition also states that it is opposed to the Greek word λευκός (leukos) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "light, bright, brilliant, clear, white, of the skin, white, fair."

It is from this word that Λουκᾶς (Loukas) is derived, which is transliterated *Luke* in the New Testament. The apostle's name was Dr. White. We also derive the English word *leukocyte*, the white blood cells in the body, from this word. Finally, the definition says that *of men* it also means *black* and gives the Latin phrase *hic niger est* as an example. This phrase literally says *this is a black*. As is illustrated in this Latin citation given by Liddell and Scott, μέλας (melas) corresponds with the Latin word *niger* which is defined by Cassel as "black, dark-coloured," and from which we get the English word *nigger*, a term meaning *black*.

Many English words are derived from μέλας (melas) including *melanoderm*, which is defined by *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* as: "a person with dark skin, specifically, a black-skinned or brown-skinned person." *Melanin* is derived from μέλας (melas), which is the term used to identify the black pigments in skin. Another word derived from μέλας (melas) is *melanize* which means, according to the same dictionary, "to render dark or black." It is this *to melanize* that we contend is meant by μολύνω (moluno), our subject word. Obviously, when this is applied to a person, a white person for example, it would mean to make him darker, to increase the amount of melanin in the skin that makes him appear darker or black.

If we look back at the definition given μολύνω (moluno) by Liddell and Scott, the last phrase reads *of meat - to let it get roasted on the outside only*. This would correspond to what we call letting the meat get burnt, for the outside is a crisp black while the inside may not be done at all. Thus, the word

XVI
SRN 3436 μολυσμός-molusmos

Μολυσμός (molusmos), which is pronounced mol-oos-mos´, occurs only once in the New Testament (II Corinthians 7:1), and four times in the Septuagint (I Esdras 8:83 (x2), Jeremiah 23:15, II Maccabees 5:27). We will look first at II Corinthians 7:1, which reads in the King James Version:

"Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God."

Let us look now at a the AST:

"Then having these promises, beloved, let us purify ourselves from all mongrelization of flesh and of mentality, fulfilling separation in the fear of God."

The word *purify* is translated for the Greek word καθαρίσωμεν (katharisthmen), the second person singular, aorist first, imperative, passive voice form of καθαρίζω (katharizo) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to cleanse, purify, make clean." *Fulfilling* is translated for the Greek word ἐπιτελοῦντες (epitelountes), the nominative plural, masculine, participle, present, active voice form of ἐπιτελέω (epiteleo) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to complete, finish, to fulfill, accomplish." *Separation* is translated for the Greek word ἁγιωσύνην (hagiosunen), accusative singular of ἁγιωσύνη (hagiosune), which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "sanctity, holiness," but also carries the connotation of *separation.*

The word *mongrelization* is translated for the Greek word μολυσμοῦ (molusmou), the genitive singular of μολυσμός (molusmos), our subject word. Μολυσμός (molusmos) is in

μολύνω (moluno) can be used of a great variety of things, and, as we see in our next verse, is used of a great variety of things even in the New Testament.

We look next at Revelations 3:4, which reads in the King James Version:

"Thou hast a few names even in Sardis which have not defiled their garments; and they shall walk with me in white: for they are worthy."

Let us now look at the AST:

"You also have a few names in Sardis which did not defile their robes, and they will walk with Me in white because they are worthy."

Here we have translated ἐμόλυναν (emolunan), the third person plural, indicative, active voice of μολύνω (moluno), our subject word, as *defile*. This could, of course, also be translated *darken*, a choice supported even in the passage itself, because later we see it is contrasted with *white*. In our next verse, however, we see it once again used with physical connotations. With this understanding of the meaning of the Greek, it focuses attention upon the idea that the white robe was metaphorical of the white body.

Thus, finally, we look at Revelation 14:4, which reads in the King James Version:

"These are they which were not defiled with women; for they are virgins. These are they which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. These were redeemed from among men, being the firstfruits unto God and to the Lamb."

Let us now examine the AST:

"These are those who were not defiled with women, for they are virgins. These are the ones following the

Lamb wherever He may go. These were redeemed from among men as first-fruit to God and to the Lamb."

In this instance, while archaic, the King James Version was satisfactory in its translation. We have translated the word defiled for ἐμολύνθησαν (emolunthesan), the third person plural, indicative, passive voice of μολύνω (moluno), our subject word. It has been translated *defiled* in this instance and not *mongrelized* only because it is clear the passage carries two connotations.

While the women in question are not racially identified, if they are non-white, then the subject would be *mongrelization* which is encompassed in the term *defiled*. If they are white, then the word *defiled* can still be used for it is clear that *mongrelization* is not the only issue. Much the same was true of the previous verse. The more general translation covers all of the concepts, but it must be remembered that one of those concepts is definitely racial.

While the word παρθένος (parthenos) which we have translated virgins does indeed mean *virgin*, it also carries the meaning of *chaste* and *pure*, and it would be this meaning implied rather than *virgin*. Thus, the verse is in reference to true white Israelites who did not mongrelize themselves with the racially polluted women offered to them by the love-religions of ancient Babylon.

fact an advanced form of the Greek word μολύνω (moluno), the subject of Chapter 15. Thus, they are synonymous and we must see μολύνω (moluno) for the definition of μολυσμός (molusmos). In Chapter 15, we concluded that μολύνω (moluno) carried the meaning of *to darken, to make black,* whether we speak of the world of ideas or of the physical, experimental world, and when it is applied to people, *to mongrelize.* It would be redundant to show the research for the word μολύνω (moluno) again, and thus we shall look at the Septuagintal occurrences.

The first Septuagint occurrence to be considered is I Esdras 8:83. This is the verse numbering found in Brenton's; in other texts and in the NETS, the words are found in chapter 8, verse 80. I Esdras is in the Apocrypha of Brenton's translation. I Esdras 8:83 reads in Brenton's translation:

"That the land, which ye enter into to possess as an heritage, is a land polluted with the pollutions of the strangers of the land, and they have filled it with their uncleanness."

Let us now look at a more accurate translation:

"The land which you go into to receive as an inheritance, is a land that has been mongrelized by mongrels of another race of the land, and they have filled it with their uncleanness."

The phrase *go into* is translated for the Greek word εἰσέρχεσθε (eiserchesthe), and is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to go or come into, to enter." The phrase *receive as an inheritance* is translated for the Greek word κληρονομῆσαι (kleronomesai) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to obtain a portion or lot, to receive a share of an inheritance, to inherit." The phrase *that has been mongrelized* is translated for the Greek word μεμολυσμένη (memolusmene), the accusative singular, participle, perfect tense, passive voice of μολυσμός (molusmos), our subject word. This usage is an ideal example

of the usage of the participle in the Greek. The participle is a verbal adjective, and here μεμολυσμένη (memolusmene) acts as an adjective by modifying *land*, yet still retains the verbal form in the perfect tense. *By mongrels* is translated for the word μολυσμῷ (molusmo), the dative plural of μολυσμός (molusmos), our subject word. This word belongs to a specialized form of the dative, the instrumental dative, specifically, the instrumental of means, which is translated with either *with* or *by*. Brenton chose to use *with* in his translation where he has rendered the word μολυσμῷ (molusmo) as *with the pollutions*. We feel that the point is expressed more clearly by the use of the word *by* in our translation where we have translated the word μολυσμῷ (molusmo) as *by mongrels*.

The words *of another race* are translated for the Greek word ἀλλογενῶν (allogenon), the genitive singular of ἀλλογενής (allogenes) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "of another race." Since it belongs to the genitive case, we have used the word *of* as a modifier to show possession belonging to the phrase *by mongrels*. *Of the land* is translated for the Greek word γῆς (ges), genitive singular of γῆ (ge) and which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "earth, soil, the land." Once again, since it belongs to the genitive case, we have translated it using the word *of* to show possession belonging to *another race*.

In order to truly understand this verse, we must examine also the following verse, which we shall give only in Brenton's translation as it is fairly accurate. Thus, I Esdras 8:84 (8:82 in others) reads in Brenton's translation:

> **"Therefore now shall ye not join your daughters unto their sons, neither shall ye take their daughters unto your sons."**

The Bible could not be more explicit in rendering a clear prohibition against race-mixing.

The next Septuagint occurrence is in Jeremiah 23:15, which reads in Brenton's translation:

"Therefore thus saith the Lord; Behold, I will feed them with pain, and give them bitter water to drink: for from the prophets of Jerusalem has defilement gone forth into the all the land."

Let us now examine a better translation:

"Therefore the Master said: I will feed them with pain, and give them to drink bitter water: because from the prophets of Jerusalem, mongrelization has gone out into all the land."

Brenton's translation of this passage was without great error. Our only major change is our subject word. We have translated *mongrelization* for μολυσμός (molusmos), our subject word in the nominative singular. Here, Jeremiah explicitly defines the great evil of the Jerusalem temple cult, and directly connects their philosophy to that of promoting race-mixing.

Finally, we look at II Maccabees 5:27, which reads in Brenton's translation:

"But Judas Maccabeus with nine others, or thereabout, withdrew himself into the wilderness, and lived in the mountains after the manner of beasts, with his company, who fed on herbs continually, lest they should be partakers of the pollution."

Here we examine a better translation:

"But Judas Maccabeus with ten, or thereabout, retreated to the deserted place, and in the habit of beasts they lived in the mountains, and with his company continually feeding on grain, unless they should become partakers of the mongrelization."

The Greek declares that the motivation for the Maccabees

was to not partake in *mongrelization*, but it is more likely that the word was used to convey a political position rather than a physical act. Brenton has committed two errors with his translation of this passage. First, he translated δέκατός (dekatos) as *nine*, when the word actually means *ten* and is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "ten." Other major translations agree with Brenton, and translate it as variants of *with nine others*, reading the passage to be counting Judas as *the tenth*. While the word means, *tenth*, as in the ordinal position in some readings, it also means *ten as a round number*. So, it remains incorrect, in our view, to apply such a precise number as nine, or to imply that the number was precisely ten by saying Judas and nine others. It is a small issue, but a rather typical response for translators to mislead by translating what they think the author meant to say instead of what the author did say. It is a rough estimate of the number of men at about ten.

The other major error with his translation is his rendition of *herbs* for the word σιτούμενοι (sitoumenoi) which we have translated *grain* and which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "wheat, corn, grain, meal, flour, bread." Other errors include his reversal of the order of the fifth phrase. *Retreated* is translated for the Greek word ἀναχωρήσας (anachoresas) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a going back, retiring, retreating." *Deserted place* is translated for the Greek word ἔρημον (eremon) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "lonely, lone, desert, lone, solitary, desolate." The word *mongrelization* is translated for the Greek word μολυσμοῦ (molusmou), the genitive plural of μολυσμός (molusmos), our subject word. A true translation of this verse remains of great historical significance, for it declares that the motivation behind the Maccabean revolt, at least for the Maccabees, was race-mixing.

Appendix I
SRN 955-Belial

Thayer defines the word Belial as: 'worthlessness, wickedness.' From *The Zondervan Pictorial Bible Dictionary,* we read:

> An epithet of scorn and disdain that appears frequently throughout the OT, either as such or in its associate variation, 'Son of Belial'. The term implied 'reckless,' 'lawless.' The word also came to be used as a synonym for 'vain fellow' or 'fool,' a 'good for nothing.' Nabal receives such a description from the lips of Abagail, his wife.
>
> The Apostle Paul employs the term once where Belial stands as opposed to Christ, thus approaching the diabolical status of antichrist. In this later usage it is frequently employed by Jewish Apocalyptic writers for both Satan and antichrist.

The importance of this word and concept becomes clear, when we realize that Paul contrasts it with the word Anointed or χριστός (Christos).

Throughout the history of Israel there has always been a strand of incorrigible white people who appear to have been born as bastard slips, without the inherent capacity to contain the Spirit of the Living God. Archibald Henry Sayce said:

> It will be seen that the tribes and cities of which Canaan is said to have been the father were related to one another only geographically. The blond Amorite and the yellow-skinned Hittite of the north had nothing in common from a racial point of view either with one another or with the Semitic tribes of Canaan. Geography and not ethnology has caused them to be grouped together' (Sayce, *Races of the Old Testament*, pp. 92-93).
>
> Even in Biblical times the Jewish race was by no means a pure one. David, we are told, was blond and red haired, which may possibly indicate an infusion of foreign blood. At all events he surrounded himself with a body-

guard of Cherethites or Kretans, and among his chief officers we find an Ammonite, an Arabian, and a Syrian of Maachah. The ark found shelter in the house of a Philistine of Gath, and one of the most trusty captains of the Israelitish army, whose wife afterwards became the ancestress of the kings of Judah, was Uriah the Hittite' (Sayce, *Races of the Old Testament*, pp. 115-116).

It is clear that Sayce's humanistic view of history caused him to fail to correctly analyze the facts. However, his work does serve to illustrate that the Middle East, in its earlier history, was predominantly of Aryan races. This better explains a portion of the mixed multitude that followed Moses from Egypt, and suggests the true Adamites to have been the red-headed race, but that they had intermarried with assimilable races of the blond heads and brunette strands of the Aryans. Be this as it may, it is clear that the Negro had little if any effect upon the racial lines of ancient times except to be used as weapons of war by the Babylonians from the time of the first recorded racial war of secular history between the Adamites and the Blackheads of Ancient Babylon.

Thus, the Old Testament evidence strongly suggests, by implication, that there has been, throughout the history of Israel a bastard slip, an incorrigible element of whites, who, although white in physical appearance and of assimilable racial streams, were in their nature without capacity for the understanding of higher Adamic morality. They were the dregs of society, the white-trash of their era, who were reasoned to have been infused with the blood of, or to be the sons of, Belial. This phrase became a euphemism for such people.

Thus, it becomes important to establish the origin of this common euphemism.

So it is in the Vatican and the majority of MSS., and in many early ecclesiastical writers. *Beliar* [*sic*] is from the Syriac, literally signifying that which *profits not*, but injures, and is rendered in the Peschito-Syriac by the word *Satan*

(*The Emphatic Diaglott*, p. 613, II Corinthians 6:15).

By the time of the Apostle Paul, a true account of history would more than justify the conclusion that the Apostle Paul employed the word in connection with contemporary race-traitors.

It should be remembered that the word *Belial* was a word of Hebrew origin employed by the school of Pharisees; in other words, it was a traditional Pharisaical concept and designation that would have been understood by any Israelite familiar with Pharisaical theology.

When we seek to ascertain the meaning of the word, as generally understood traditionally, we find that in the Septuagint this same word translated *Belial* in the Masoretic Text was translated by two different Greek words in the older Septuagint.

Of the occurrences of *Belial* in the LXX, it was translated by two Greek words, λοιμός (loimos), and παρανομία (paranomia). Λοιμός (loimos) is defined by Liddell and Scott: as "a plague, pestilence, any deadly disorder, a plague, pest." Παρανομία (paranomia) is defined by Liddell and Scott as "the character and conduct of a παράνομος (paranomos), transgression of law, of decency or order, loose and disorderly habits." The compound word παράνομος (paranomos) is defined by Liddell and Scott as "contrary to law and custom, unlawful, illegal, and generally, unjust, violent, cruel, ὀργή (orge), δάκος (dakos), illegality, proposing unconstitutional measures." Δάκος (dakos) is defined by Liddell and Scott as "an animal of which the bite or sting is dangerous, a snake, any noxious animal, a beast of prey, a bite or sting."

The word ὀργή (orge) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "natural impulse or propension, the character or disposition as resulting from impulses, the disposition, nature, heart, a mind diseased, dispositions, anger, wrath, a passion."

It seems clear that the writers of these Greek definitions did not consider race-mixing as a transgression of the law of God, for such a prohibition is clearly absent. The efforts of the translators of the Masoretic Text become very obvious, as they

sought to conceal and hide this concept through rendering the words 'Sons of Belial'; for that matter, they have led many people to believe that the concept designated a family name rather than a term for lawless race-mixers and degenerates.

This was no doubt willful deception calculated on the part of the Masoretic Jews to further aid in deceiving the Adamic Christian nations. The Septuagint is far superior in its rendering the concept as:

> **"Evil men have gone out from you, and have caused all the inhabitants of their land to fall away, saying, Let us go and worship gods of other races, whom ye knew not"** (Deuteronomy 13:13).

When we understand that sexual acts were part of the devotional acts of these false religions, then and only then do we begin to understand the true meaning of these words. This clearly connected the concept to race-traitors who followed false, humanistic religions, and we find this etymological pattern to be consistent throughout the Old and New Testament, though Paul only used the word once in the New Testament, which is in the context under consideration.

Thus, we conclude that the concept consistently carries with it the connotations: lawless, race-traitors, practitioners of false religion, insane in mind, corrupters of true government, self-hating race-traitors, and it is clear that this was Paul's understanding of the concept when he used it in II Corinthians, Chapter 6.

Appendix II
Septuagint vs. Masoretic Text

When we come to a discussion of the Scriptures, those writings referred to by Christ and His Apostles, most people do not know that the Scriptures referred to were, without question, the Greek Septuagint and not the Talmudic Rabbinical Masoretic Version, which did not exist at the time and did not come into existence until after 1000 AD or at the time of William the Conqueror.

Most people do not know or understand that the Christian writings, the New Testament, did not claim to be the Scriptures, but rather claimed to be the true interpretation of the Scriptures, and because the Christian writings claimed explicit inspiration by the Holy Spirit or the Mind of God they therefore became the Christian Scriptures.

Most people do not understand that the only true etymological link for understanding the Greek Christian writings is solely and only through the Septuagint Greek Scriptures. Modern judaized Christianity is not first century Christianity, but is rather a perversion of real Israelite Christianity, invented by the Talmudic, Rabbinical Jews in a conspiratorial effort to destroy the real teachings of Jesus Christ and His Holy Apostles. Talmudic, Rabbinical Judaism has nothing whatsoever to do with ancient Israelitism, and because Rabbinical Judaism is based upon the most fantastic lie of the ages, the Jew must go to any extreme to continue to perpetuate the Great Satanic lie. In truth, Christianity is a direct descendant of the philosophical schools of the dispersed Israelites. Yet, the Jewish lie is so interwoven into the fabric of Judeoized western culture that it is even difficult for many who profess to understand a true identification of the Israelites to escape the Judeoism of the twentieth century.

Judeos are notorious for confusing Israelites with Jews. They consistently repeat the blasphemy that Jesus was a Jew. One thing that all Judeos have in common is their dependency upon the Talmudic Rabbinical, Masoretic text for their

religious authority. When we turn to the early history of the Christians, we find that this worship of Rabbinical authority was a comparatively recent development, for the early Christians were not so stupid as to prop up the antichrist Jew as their religious authority.

W.D. Killen writes of Origen (b. 185-d. 254) in his book *The Ancient Church: Its History, Doctrine, Worship, and Constitution*:

> Of his celebrated 'hexapla,' to which he is said to have devoted much of his time for eight and twenty years, only some fragments have been preserved. This great work appears to have been undertaken to meet the cavils of the Jews against the Septuagint-the Greek translation of the Old Testament in current use in the days of the apostles, and still more appreciated by the Christians. The unbelieving Israelites (Jews) now pronounced it a corrupt version; and, that all might have an opportunity of judging for themselves, Origen exhibited the text in six consecutive columns-the first, containing the original Hebrew-the second, the same in Greek letters-and the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth, four of most famous of the Greek translations, including the Septuagint. (The three other Greek versions were those of Aquilla, of Symmachus, and of Theodotion) (p. 379).

The purpose of bringing forth this information is to show that early in the Christian existence the controversy was clearer than it is today. The purpose of this article is to analyze some of the lines of separation that have been changed. We know beyond any doubt that the antichrist Jewish agenda during Origen's time was to discredit and do away with the Septuagint. It is also clear that even at that time the Herodian Pharasaical Jewish version of the so-called Old Testament was understood to have been corrupted by the same Jews that put Christ to death. Their descendants are now arguing with the Christian ministers that the Septuagint was a corrupted version. Yet, history records that the Septuagint was translated 280 years before Christ.

Moreover, all of the quotations of Scriptures in the New Testament make it clear that the Septuagint was the only

Scripture Christ and His Apostles recognized.[30] Christ and His Apostles could not have quoted the Masoretic Text because it was not written until a thousand years after their day. Further, it was written in a degenerated language which they neither wrote nor spoke. This logic, however, eludes the simple, mind-controlled Judeo who refuses to acknowledge that the Israelites in dispersion were a Hellenized Greek-speaking people, and that by the time of Christ the Israelite language was the language of the day, which of course was Greek. Christ states clearly that He had come only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, a clear reference to the dispersed Israelites. The Talmudic Jews have gone to extraordinary lengths to seek to hide the true Israelite connection to Christianity. Yet, the science of etymology and the records of history disclose the indisputable fact that the ancestral philosophy of first century Christianity was that taught by the Greek-speaking Israelites dispersed throughout the known world, formally represented by the great center of Israelite learning in Alexandria, Egypt.

It becomes extremely important to understand that there are no Hebrew manuscripts written in the original Hebrew. Someone may ask: "Where did we get the Hebrew manuscript that the King James Version was based upon in 1611?" These manuscripts are called Masoretic manuscripts, and they did not exist in their completion before the tenth century A.D.

The translation of the Septuagint, beginning somewhere around 280 years before Christ, took nearly 100 years to complete. The oldest copies of the Septuagint in existence are from about 250 A.D., and some fragments of the Septuagint are possibly older. The Masoretic Text is a manuscript of the Old Testament written in Hebrew. It is the oldest copy in existence of the so-called Hebrew scriptures and it dates from about 1050 A.D. It is this text that was used for all of the translations of the Hebrew Old Testament. The Masoretic Text received its name from the Jewish, Talmudist school of the

---

[30] J. Paterson Smyth says of the Septuagint in How We Got Our Bible: "It was made at different time, beginning somewhere about 280 B.C., and was the version commonly used by the Evangelists and Apostles."

Masoretes or Traditionalists, who flourished between the seventh and ninth centuries A.D.[31]

During the 1000 year lapse of time from the time of Christ to the time of William the Conqueror, the Jews methodically gathered up, sometimes at great expense, every known existing Hebrew text available. Moreover, they made it a point to promote the destruction or they themselves destroyed the works of early Christians such as Origen, who might have shed light on the true ancient language of Hebrew.

During the 1000 years the Jews spent gathering all the ancient Hebrew manuscripts and especially during the last 200 years of the Masoretic school of Khazar Jews, who by their own admission have no blood-line connection to the ancient Israelites, and who composed this Cabalistic and Talmudic school, continued recopying the manuscripts and invariably made more and more mistakes. For example, all of the older manuscripts in Hebrew were written without vowels. As a result, many words were interchangeable. Because of this, the Masoretes made careless (or intentionally misleading) decisions in the selection of which vowel signs and pictures to add.

Also, they were responsible for a great amount of deliberate glossing, that is, they took many Hebrew words, which they felt were obsolete or did not know their meaning, (and in truth were beyond their understanding as a result of the evolution and degeneration of their command of the Hebrew language, and it should be carefully noted that the Hebrew of today is not the ancient Hebrew), and replaced them with different words, which in many cases were not sufficient words and thus led to the watering-down of many passages. Also, when the Masoretes were in the process of revising the text, it had to be copied over and over again, which caused a number of problems.

---

[31] The Encyclopedia Britannica says of the Masoretic text that it was "begun around the 6th century AD and completed in the 10th by scholars at Talmudic academies in Babylonia and Palestine."

HEARING PROBLEMS

1) If the text was being read to them, the scribes would, in many cases, replace negative Hebrew particles with prepositional forms of the words that they thought they heard. This occurred because many Hebrew particles could not be expressed orally, and as a result of this a great number of negative Hebrew particles were lost.

2) Another problem that arose from reading the text aloud was the running together of a great number of Hebrew words. When the reader read the text aloud to the scribes, some Hebrew words, when read one after the other, would sound like one Hebrew word and the meaning of the text was changed when the scribes replaced the two Hebrew words with the one Hebrew word that he thought he heard.

VISUAL PROBLEMS

Most people would ask the question, "Why didn't they simply copy the text by reading the manuscript themselves?" In many cases this is exactly what they did, but even this method was not fool-proof. Even when a scribe would look at the material he was copying, there were still many other common mistakes that occurred.

1) The Hebrew alphabet has many graphically similar letters, which might be mistaken for one another, especially when one considers the fact that all of the text was hand written. In addition to this, the vowels signs, which are small, could have been, and were definitely in many cases, overlooked, thus changing the word and the intended meaning of the text. There is an incredible number of instances where this has occurred when compared to the pure Greek of the Septuagint.

2) Another mistake was dittography, resulting usually from distraction, this is when the duplication of one or more words or letters occurs.

3) Another major problem was homoeoteleuton. This is when the passage being copied by the scribe has two separate phrases that have identical endings, and the copyist skips a line when his eye catches the same ending further down in the text.

4) Haplography is much the opposite. This is when the scribe has two phrases together in his passage and he skips one thinking that he has already copied the passage earlier, and has simply read it again.

Many problems of this sort occurred time and time again over the two hundred years of adulteration to this text. Prior to that, during 800 years of constant copying, there were years of gradual deterioration, especially as the Scriptures fell into the hands of Khazar Jews and the knowledge of Hebrew was continually lost. In point of fact, there were few Hebrew scholars even at the time of Christ.

Glossing perhaps may have been the Masoretes most powerful weapon against the pure Scriptures. In this process they would take a word that occurred a hundred or even perhaps a thousand times and replace it with a different word and a different meaning. If this did not weaken or change the meaning of the text sufficiently, they would reword entire passages which resulted in an impure text. All of this was in agreement with their Talmudic theology, which is the real authority for their antichrist, anti-Israelite religion. The Talmudic Jews do not accept the Scriptures as having any authority for their religion, and whenever there is a conflict between what the law of God may actually say, the Jew always defers to the Rabbinical Talmudists. In other words, the Jews' Bible is the Talmud, not what we Christians call the Bible. The Septuagint, however, was translated directly from the Hebrew originals.

The Masoretic Text was constructed from copies, that were from copies, that were from copies, of which there may have been dozens, and then was adulterated by the Masoretes in their continuous glossing, haplography, dittography, and their

deliberate rewording of passages based upon their Talmudic theology. After they had completed their adulterated text, all older texts, including the ones that they had used for their adulteration, mysteriously disappeared, and all translations since have been based upon this clearly unreliable text. Anyone who is knowledgeable of the Septuagint and the Masoretic text will quickly agree that when compared, there is a considerable difference. The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Qumran have indeed proven the superior fidelity of the Greek Septuagint to the Masoretic Text to the Old Hebrew.

One general rule of translating states that the older the manuscript, the more likely it is to contain fewer mistakes[32]. This of course demonstrates that the Septuagint is the more reliable of the two.

There are many under Talmudic influence who teach that the Septuagint is just another translation. They rationalize that if it were translated into English, it would lead to more mistakes. This kind of prejudicial rationalizing has concluded that the Masoretic Text is more reliable, even with its thousands of mistakes, because it is still the Hebrew, the "sacred" language, the language of the "chosen people".

However, they never bother to explain why Hebrew is more sacred than Phoenician or Aramaic or Greek; the fallacy of such arguments becomes apparent when we understand that the ancient Hebrew is more akin to the ancient Phoenician than the Aramaic[33], and there is no question that there was tremendous social intercourse between the Phoenician and the Hellens. When we understand that the Book of Job, long revered by the ancient Israelites, is in truth an Israelite version

---

32 Smyth again says: "So that it is evident, as copies increased, the errors would be likely to increase with them, and therefore as a general rule,the earlier any manuscript, the more likely it is to be correct" (How We Got Our Bible, p. 4).

33 H.G. Wells writes in Outline of History: "To Phoenicians after the fall of Tyre and Carthage, conversion to Judaism must have been particularly easy and attractive. Their language was closely akin to Hebrew."

of a Greek tragedy[34], then we begin to understand that the Adamic Israelites possessed a natural affinity toward other Adamic non-mongrelized races. Even the history of ancient Israel records that Abraham's father Terah fled the ancient Sumerian society to avoid racial mongrelization. It is therefore the height of stupidity to allow the mongrelized Edomite Jews to identify themselves with the ancient Israel of God. Yet, the Edomite, Pharisaical, Talmudic lie has been so often told to the Adamic Christian nations that they are now held captive to their own willful ignorance. Their racial and spiritual salvation lies solely in their overcoming the antichrist, Talmudic lie and rejecting the Jews as their religious authorities.

Thus, while it is true that a translation from a translation may result in some mistakes, many would do well to remember and to fix clearly in their minds that the Masoretic Text is not from the original Hebrew. There were few Hebrew scholars even before and during the time of Christ. Almost a thousand years later, by the time of the Masoretic school, it is doubtful that there were any true Hebrew scholars at all.

It thus becomes a question of either translating from the Septuagint, a faithful translation that was made with manuscripts that were at the time no more than 500 years old, or from Talmudists' translation of the Masoretic Text with all of its glossing, rewording and deliberate adulteration of manuscripts that were no older at the time of the King James Version translation than 200 or 300 years, and which in its adoption sets the Jew up as the authority for Christian thought and opens the door to a degenerate metaphysics and romanticism all from a Talmudic point of view, and which had been distorted throughout the centuries by copyists and Talmudic theologians for over one thousand years.

Any Christian who believes the words of Jesus Christ, who understands the Jew's position in the first, second, and third centuries as to their hatred of the Septuagint and how that for the first four hundred years the early Christians refused to

---

34 Wells again says "Of such books as Job, said to be an imitation of Greek tragedy . . ." p. 215, vol. 1.

give credence to any of their scriptural translations, will clearly understand that the Septuagint is the most reliable Old Testament Scriptures that we have. Moreover, we do indeed have other choices. We have what is left from Origen's fragments. We have Jerome's Latin version to contrast with the Greek. Today, we have the Dead Sea Scrolls, which do serve as a source of comparison and contrast to the Masoretic Hebrew, although remaining questionable.

These facts raise some interesting questions. Why did the Jews destroy the older manuscripts? Why have the Jews been allowed to set themselves up as Hebrew authorities when most if not all of their true knowledge of Hebrew comes from ancient Christian writings? Why have the Jews been allowed to perpetrate this great deception and farce over western Christianity? Why have the Jews been allowed to set themselves up as "authorities"? They were the authorities on the King James Version. Today, they are the authorities on sanity thanks to Jewish psychology. They are the authorities of our nominally "Christian" seminaries. They are the authorities on political thought, literature, history, education, WWII, Nazism, racism, metaphysics, economics, law, medicine, publishing, child rearing, media, etc.

The Masoretic school of Talmudic and Cabalic Jews began to exercise their Satanic influence over the Adamic nations by creating philosophical divisions and proselytizing Europeans to their schools or philosophical positions. This took place on two fronts, the secular and the religious. On the secular, they created the philosophy of Humanism. In the religious, they multiplied themselves, then posing as Hebrew authorities, they convinced the Christian world to accept their corrupted version of the Old Testament as authoritative and to be used in the translation of the King James Version.

To see the political intrigue involved, one need only to remember that the Protestants could have easily translated from the superior Septuagint. The Jews have laced their corrupted version with an untold number of mistranslations, to provide for the future corruption of Christianity. Moreover, the Jews saw to it that they were ever present and abundantly

so on the translation teams appointed by King James. As always, they saw to it that they purposely placed misleading translations in the English to provide themselves points of controversy that they could use, knowing that in the future these could be used to further corrupt and divide Christianity. For example, they inferred that there was a "Book of Jasher," which never existed. Later it was the Jews, from a publishing house in London, who mysteriously found and published the book. It became widely accepted as gospel among the Freemasons and the Rosicrucians, which were both Jewish inspired and orchestrated organizations. What rust is to iron, and what tarnish is to silver and gold, and what the moth is to garments, that is what the Jew is to Christianity.

All Jewish thought processes are based upon a lie and the art of lying, of which they are the masters. The Jew possesses diabolical genius, not only of conceiving a corruption, but of carrying that corruption through regardless of how long it may take. The Jew clearly understands his agenda and his aims and purposes, and he thinks in principle rather than circumstances. For this reason he is able to change his faces and his guises to accommodate his goals. He is as accepted among his fellows whether he declares himself to be a Jew-conservative or liberal, traditional or modern, an agnostic or atheist, communist or capitalist, homosexual or heterosexual, or any nationality – so long as he is against Christ.

The diabolical Jew understands more clearly what it means to be against Christ than most professing Christians. The diabolical Jew, like the chameleon, will assume any background to fit into his surroundings. He will become, at least in name, any kind of a Judeo-Christian and nationality all with one interest in mind: to assume the leadership role and to corrupt. It is no small wonder that the Masoretic school of Talmudic Judaism worked so long and hard to become recognized authorities. For they knew that once they had gained recognition as "honest scholars" they would one day be able to influence any expression or denomination of pseudo Christianity that might arise. For once they are recognized as the authority, they then have the power to rescind any

findings. The Talmudic Jews' agenda has never changed. All the Jews need to do is raise up an authority, sanction him with accolades, and the phony Christian will have an "important book," or, at least, these phony Christians are suddenly told they have a "important book".

Appendix III
The New English Translation of the Septuagint

Since the original edition of this work, the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (IOSCS) has produced *The New English Translation of the Septuagint*, published by Oxford University Press. This publication marks only the third English Translation of the Septuagint. Sir Lancelot Brenton's work was the second; Charles Thomson's translation was the first. Brenton's translation was far more influential than Thomson, which excluded the Apocrypha and was published only in English; while Brenton's version contained the Greek text in parallel and also the Apocrypha. The Septuagint in Greek was the text of the early Christian Church, and the Greek Orthodox Church continued to use the Septuagint, although Jerome's Latin Vulgate had supplanted the Septuagint in the Roman Catholic Church. The influence of the rabbinic Jews on Jerome's Latin version is well documented; and the dominant English language Old Testament was and remains the King James Version, which is based upon the Hebrew and canon of the Masoretic Text. The Greek Septuagint Scriptures were used by Jesus and His Apostles, and it is ever more imperative that the true Scriptures are restored to their proper place as authoritative over the Masoretic Text and all its various language translations.

This is not to say that scholars have not continued to reference the Greek of the Septuagint; it is clear, however, that an emphasis in Greek and Latin classical education has become non-existent, particularly in America. It is apparent that a new translation into English from the Greek Septuagint is a necessary and welcome event. However, it is also clear that the Talmudists have not left alone the scholarship involved in the translation of the NETS and Septuagintal scholarship in general. On the other hand, the scholarship of

the German societies has brought to light much truth, not only regarding the Greek language, but the ancient Hebrew language as well. In this translation of the Septuagint, the translators have at their disposal more and better textual criticism and texts, and also better Greek scholarship than Brenton, Thomson, and even the King James Version translators, had available. Thus, a careful student, equipped with this book, Brenton's translation, the NETS, and a carefully selected library of Greek lexicons and lexical aids (see our bibliography), should be able to discern the racial truths of the Old Testament Septuagint. Because of the relatively recent publication of the NETS, and the lingering influence of Brenton's, this book has not been updated in every instance to reflect how the NETS has rendered the Old Testament Scriptures. The student is therefore encouraged to engage in this studious, albeit tedious, practice, and in so doing, may reap the rewards of learning the discipline of the Greek language and the Old Testament Scriptures, while developing the critical skills necessary for rightly dividing the Scriptures.

One important instance of honest translation of the NETS is found in II Esdras 23:3 (Nehemiah 13:3 Brenton). This passage is translated:

"And it happened, when the people heard the law, and every person of mixed race in Israel was separated."

Brenton renders this passage in Nehemiah 13:3:

"And it came to pass, when they heard the law, that they were separated, even every *alien in Israel." (*Gr. mixed one - *note in Brenton*)

The contrast in translating this Scripture by Brenton and the translator of the NETS is readily apparent. The meaning of the Greek is clearly of a "mixed one," and even Brenton at least noted that in his translation, while changing the meaning of the verse by using the word "alien." This passage is

translated in the Orthodox Study Bible in Nehemiah 13:3 as **"So it was, after hearing the Law, they separated all the mixed multitude from Israel."**

The word the NETS translators translate as ***"person of mixed race"*** is ἐπιμικτος (epimiktos). Ἐπιμικτος was discussed previously in this book when it occurred in Wisdom 14:25-26, and Brenton's mistranslation of that passage was thoroughly addressed as well. Here, in the NETS, we have the scholarship once again agreeing with our translations and unveiling of the racial messages of the Bible. Ἐπιμὶξ (epimix) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "mixedly, confusedly, indiscriminately." Ἐπιμὶξ (Epimix) is the adverb form of ἐπιμίγνυμι (epimignumi) which is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to mix in or with, to mingle with, to have intercourse or dealings with." Both are combinations of the prefix ἐπί- (epi-) and μίξις (mixis) and μίγνυμι (mignumi) respectively. Μίξις (mixis) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "a mixing, mingling, intercourse with, esp. sexual intercourse." Μίγνυμι (Mignumi) is defined by Liddell and Scott as: "to mix, mix up, mingle, join, bring together, to have intercourse with a person, to have intercourse with, to be united to, both of the man and the woman." It is from these two Greek words that the concept of *mix* and *mixing* has emanated into all major languages in various forms such as the German *mischen*, the Latin *misceo*, the Spanish *mixtura*, and our own English *mix*.

The context of this verse in II Esdras (Nehemiah) clearly states the racial message. Many will argue that the *race* can here be watered down to have expressed simple tribal and therefore religious differences, but is not necessarily an expression of white and dark races mixing. This is a willful lie, but we will turn now to examine the Hebrew words, as well, to clearly show that the understanding was that of the mixing of the white or Adamic with the mixed or dark "Arabians."

In the Hebrew Masoretic Text, the word in this passage is עֵרֶב, and is transliterated as ereb, phonetically pronounced (ay'-reb). In Strong's Concordance On-Line, this word is Hebrew SRN 6154 and given the short definition of *Arabia*. Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew On-Line Dictionary defines the

word as "mixture, mixed company; - heterogeneous body attached to a people; to Israel Exodus 12:38 (E), Nehemiah 13:3; to Egyptians Jeremiah 25:20 (^{n}9 joins to Jeremiah 25:19, so Gie); to Chaldeans Jeremiah 50:37; in Jeremiah 25:24 strike out וְאֵת הָעֵרֶב as doublet (so Gie, compare ^{m}5); in 1 Kings 10:15 read עֲרָב (as "" 2 Chronicles 9:14, so Benz Kit and others); Ezekiel 30:5 read probably id. (Co). II. עֵרֶב noun [masculine] woof (as mixed, interwoven, with warp); — Leviticus 13:48 + 8t. 13 (all opposed to שְׁתִי warp), compare GFMPAOS 1889, clxxviii" (Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon, Unabridged, Electronic Database).

The New Strong's Expanded Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible defines the word as "Arabia, mingled people, mixed multitude, woof."

"6154. {11x} ereb, *ay'-reb*; or ereb (1 Kin 10:15), (with the art. pref.) *eh' -reb*; from 6148; the *web* (or transverse threads of cloth); also a *mixture*, (or *mongrel* race): -woof {9x}, mixed multitude {2x}. See: TWOT -1685a, 1685b; BDB - 786b, 786c."

When we examine Strong's entry for SRN 6148, we find the definition "to braid, i.e. *intermix*; tech. to *traffic* (as if to *give* or *be security* (as a kind of exchange)."

So, we see that clearly this word carries a meaning of *intermix*, and thus the connotation is clear when discussing persons that the issue is *racial* intermixing. Strong's addresses the Hebrew root word separately for this word *arab* or *ereb* in SRN 6148-6169, and also SRN 693-696. Interestingly, these words are the same three Hebrew characters, differing only by the vowel points. SRN 6153 is the Hebrew word used for *dusk* or *evening*, but when applied to people clearly means *dusky-skinned, mixed* people or *dusky Arabs*, the result of admixture and therefore *mongreled* or *mixed race*. From Strong's Concordance:

"{137x} ereb, *eh'-reb*; from 6150; *dusk:* - *even* {72x},

evening {47x}, night {4x}, mingled {2x}, people {2x}, eventide {2x}, eveningtide +6256 {2x}, Arabia {1x}, days {1x}, even +996 {1x}, evening + 3117 {1x}, evening + 6256 {1x}, eventide + 6256 {1x}.

'Ereb means "evening, night." (1) This word represents the time of the day immediately preceding and following the setting off the sun. (1a) During this period, the dove returned to Noah's ark (Gen. 8:11). (1b) Since it was cool, women went to the wells for water in the "evening" (Gen 24:11). (1c) It was at "evening" that David walked around on top of his roof to refresh himself and cool off, and observed Bathsheba taking a bath (2 Sa 11:2). In its first biblical appearance, *'ereb* marks the opening of a day: "And the evening and the morning were the first day" (Gen. 1:5) (1d) The phrase "in the evening" [literally, "between the evenings"] means the period between sunset and darkness, "twilight" (Ex 12:6; KJV, "in the evening"). (2) Second, in poetical use, the word can mean "night" : "When I lie down, I say, When shall I arise, and the night be gone? And I am full of tossings to and fro unto the dawning of the day" (Job 7:4). See. TWOT - 1689a; BDB - 787d.

When we examine SRN 6150, we find the following: "{3x} arab, aw-rab'; a prim. root [rather ident. with 6148 through the idea of *covering* with a texture]; to *grow dusky* at sundown: - evening {2x}, darkened {1x}. See: TWOT - 1689; BDB - 788." Finally, the root word is listed as SRN 6151, and defined as "to *commingle* -mix" by Strong.

It is apparent from the Hebrew language, corrupted as it is by the Masoretic Text and Strong's, that the Hebrew word used in contrast to *Adam* and his descendants racially (ruddy, able to show blood in the face) was *Arab*, used to describe the dusky inhabitants of the region. These *dusky* inhabitants, with whom Adam's race had commingled against God's Laws, were put away by the people "after they heard the law." The law they heard read, according to II Esdras 23:1-3, must have been Deuteronomy 23.

"On that day there was read from the book of Moyses in the hearing of the people, and there was found written in it that Ammanites and Moabites should not enter in the assembly of God forever, because they did not meet the sons of Israel with bread and with water and hired Balaam against him (Israel) to curse him (Israel), and our God turned the curse into a blessing. And it happened, when the people heard the law, and every person of mixed race in Israel was separated" (II Esdras 23:1-3, NETS).

When we examine the book of Moses, we find the reference to Moabites and Ammanites in the first few verses of Deuteronomy chapter 23. These verses were already discussed in Chapter XIII: *nothos*. So, we have three important issues raised in this verse in II Esdras: 1) the Ammanites and Moabites were mixed, dusky, mongreled peoples, 2) the people of Israel were forbidden from mixing with them, and 3) those born of "whoredom" and mentioned in Deuteronomy 23:2 were those same mongrel people whom Jesus withstood in John 8:32.

The NETS Septuagint translators in II Esdras rightfully translate the word ἐπιμικτος as "person of mixed race." The racial statements of the Old Testament Septuagint and New Testament Greek can no longer be hidden or concealed by the confusion of the Masoretic Hebrew and their stranglehold over the English language versions of the Bible. Clearly, there are multiple instances to be found in the Old Testament where God's people, those of the race of Adam, are admonished and prohibited from intermingling or mixing with the dusky "Arabs", to use the Hebrew word for "mongrel peoples."

The Masorete school and their offspring who have set themselves as authorities of the Hebrew language are well aware of the racial truths of the Old Testament. They themselves are those dusky corrupters, liars-in-wait, who have ambushed the Adamic people and stolen their identity; the Adamic peoples in some locations practice the separate

religions of their forefathers, but they are also bombarded daily with false teachings by these ambushers who call themselves "Hebrew scholars" or "Old Testament scholars," thereby creating a separation between the Scriptures of Jesus and the New Testament, and setting themselves up as authorities of the belief system of our ancestral Adamic race. In truth, there is no separation between the Old and the New Testament, in language or in teaching, for the New Testament in Greek is the true interpretations of the Scriptures in Greek, the Septuagint, and the white Adamic people of God created in Genesis are the same people today called through Jesus Christ to return to communion and governance with God.

Appendix IV
An Explanation of Grammatical Terms Used Herein

Term.	Definition.
NOMINATIVE	Subject
ACCUSATIVE	Direct Object
DATIVE	Indirect Object, instrumental
GENITIVE	Possessive
ABLATIVE	Objective of the preposition, comparative, source, means, separation
VOCATIVE	Direct address
SINGULAR	Used to describe one object
PLURAL	Used to describe more than one object
DUAL	Used to describe two objects
MASCULINE	A word that characteristically refers to males
FEMININE	A word that characteristically refers to females
NEUTER	A word that is unspecific as to gender
PRESENT TENSE	Present tense - *is*
PERFECT TENSE	Past tense - *was*
IMPERFECT TENSE	An auxiliary to the present tense, denoting incomplete action, in its course, not yet brought to intended end
FUTURE TENSE	Future tense - *will be*
PLUPERFECT TENSE	Indicates the perfect indicative of past time

Aorist Tense	Indefinite tense, *unlimited*
Passive Voice	A verb that *receives* the action
Middle Voice	A verb that is *participating* in the *results* of the action
Active Voice	A verb that *produces* the action
Infinitive	A verbal noun
Participle	A verbal adjective
Indicative Mood	Indicates certainty
Subjunctive Mood	Indicates probability
Optative Mood	Indicates possibility
Imperative Mood	Indicates command

Appendix V
Greek Pronunciation Key

Greek		Name	Pron.	English
A	α	Alpha	Short 'a' as in *a*larm	a
	αι		'ae' in proper nouns such as Cæser, 'ai' in common words, always pronouced as in Cæser.	æ or ai
	αυ		S*ow*	au
B	β	Beta	*B*a*b*y	b
Γ	γ	Gamma	Be*g*in, *g*o	g
	γγ		A*ng*le	ng
	γκ		Ri*nk*	nk
	γκ		Ba*nk*s	nx
	γχ		Ni*ck*	nch
Δ	δ	Delta	Stan*d*ar*d*	d
E	ε	Epsilon	Short 'e' as in M*e*t	e
	ει		R*ay*	ei
	ευ		F*ew*	eu
Z	ζ	Zeta	A*dz*	z
H	η	Eta	B*ay*	e
	ηυ		Y*ou*th	eu
Θ	θ	Theta	*Th*ing	th
I	ι	Iota	M*e*teor	i
			'J' in proper nouns when followed by vowel	
K	κ	Kappa	'C' in proper nouns, 'k' in common words. Gree*k*	c or k
Λ	λ	Lambda	*L*ight	l
M	μ	Mu	*M*atch	m
N	ν	Nu	*N*ight	n
	νπ		*M*op	mp
	νβ		*M*ob	mb

	νφ		*Mu*ffin	mph
	νκ			gk
	νγ		Ragged	gg
	νχ			gch
	νλ		*L*ead	ll
	νμ		*M*ad	mm
	νϱ		*R*ed	rr
Ξ	ξ	Xi	Pa*cks*	x
Ο	ο	Omicron	Short 'o' as in Sh*o*p	
	οι		œ in proper nouns, oi in common words. Joy	œ or oi
	ου		F*oo*d	ou
Π	π	Pi	*P*ark	p
Ρ	ϱ	Rho	*R*obe	r
	ϱϱ		A*rr*ow	rrh
Σ	σ	Sigma	*S*ir	s
	ς		Final form.	
Τ	τ	Tau	*T*in	t
Υ	υ	Upsilon	*U*nder	u
	υι		S*wee*t	we
Φ	φ	Phi	*F*ine	ph
Χ	χ	Chi	*Kh*an	ch
Ψ	ψ	Psi	Ma*ps*	ps
Ω	ω	Omega	Long 'o' as in R*o*pe.	o
῾		Rough Breathing	Written over or on the left side of a vowel or diphthong, pronounced as English 'h', as in *ó* pronounced 'ho.' Also can go with the letter ϱ, as ῥ to make the sound 'rh' as in *Rh*ode Island.	h
᾽		Smooth Breathing	Written over a vowel or diphthong, and is not pronounced or transliterated.	

Analytical Greek Lexicon. Samuael Bagster and Sons, London.

Bauer, Walter, with William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Ginrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1958.

Berry, George Ricker. *The Interlinear Literal Translation of the Greek New Testament, With the Authorized Version*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishers.

Brenton, Sir Lancelot Charles. *The Septuagint With Apocrypha*. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1851.

Chadwick, Henry, D.D. F.B.A. *St. Paul and Philo of Alexandria*. Manchester: John Rylands Library, 1966.

Colson, F.H., et. al., translators. *Philo*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1949.

Feltham. *A Brief Character of the Low Countries*.

Garrison, Webb. *Strange Facts About the Bible*. Nashville: Abingdom Press, 1968.

Goodspeed, Edgar J. *The Complete Bible*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1923.

Gove, Philip Babcock, Editor. *Webster's Third New International Dictionary Unabridged*. Springfield, Massachuestts: Merriam Company, 1981.

Green, Jay P. Sr. *The Interlinear Greek-English New Testament*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Impression of 1988.

Holy Bible, The: Authorized King James Version. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode Limited.

Johnson, Allen. *Dictionary of American Biography*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1964.

Killen, W.D. *The Ancient Church: Its History, Doctrine, Worship, and Constitution*. London: James Nisbet and Company, 1859.

Lake, Kirsopp, translator. *The Apostlic Fathers*. Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press, 1985.

Lampe, G.W.H., D.D. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.

Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott, and Henry Drissler,

Ed. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1846.

Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. *A Lexicon, abridged from Liddell and Scott's Greek English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974.

MacGregor, Geddes. *A Literary History of the Bible*. Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1968.

Mayer, Günter. *Index Philoneus*. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1974.

McKechnie, Jean L. *Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary*. William Collins Publishers, 1979.

Nestle, Erwin, and Kurt Aland. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. London: United Bible Societies, 1975.

New Encyclopedia Britannica, The. Chicago: The Encyclopedia Britannica, 1989.

Rawlison, George, translator. *The Texts of the History of Herodotus*. Chicago: Encyclopedia Brittanica, 1989.

Sayce, Archibald Henry, LL.D, D.D. *The Races of the Old Testament*. London: The Religious Tract Society, 1925.

Scott, Otto. *James I: The Fool as King*. Vallecito, CA: Ross House Books, 1986.

Simpson, D.J., Editor. *Cassell's New Latin Dictionary*. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1959.

Smyth, J. Paterson. *How We Got Our Bible*. New York: James Pott and Company, 1931.

Strong, James. *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance*. Greenville, S.C.: The Gospel Hour Incorporated.

Strong, James. *The New Strong's Expanded Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*. Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2001.

Tenny, Merrill C., et. al. *The Zondervan Pictorial Bible Dictionary*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1974.

Thackeray, Henry St. John. *Josephus*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930.

Trench, Archbishop Richard Chenevix. *A Select Glossary of English Words Used Formerly in Senses Different From Their Present*. New York: W.J. Widdleton, 1860.

Trench, Archebishop Richard Chenevix. *Synonyms of the New Testament*. London: Kegen Paul, Trench Trubner, & Co.

LTD, 1906.

Wells, H.G. *The Outline of History.* Garden City: Garden City Books, 1961.

Whiston, William. *The Works of Flavius Josephus.* New York: William Walker, Publisher, 1817.

Wilson, Benjamin. *The Emphatic Diaglott: Containing the Original Greek Text of What Is Commonly Styled the New Testament (According to the Recension of Dr. J. J. Griesbach).* New York: International Bible Students Association, Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society, 1942.